

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.  
For the present, THE QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;  
the times of publication of THE REVIEW are variable under war conditions

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt., Brasenose College, Oxford

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.R.S. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.  
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A. F. H. SANDRACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)  
Prof. F. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Representing the Council of the  
Classical Association

E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.R.S. representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of Prof. K. E. RAND, Harvard University, Prof. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland  
and Prof. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume XXXV

OCTOBER 1941

Numbers 3, 4

## CONTENTS

THE DATE OF ARCHILOCHOS. F. JACOBY . . . . .	97
SOME TEXTUAL NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S MORALIA. F. H. SANDRACH . . . . .	110
XENOPHANES, FRAGMENT 3. C. M. BOWRA . . . . .	119
THE SINGULAR USE OF NOS IN VIRGIL. W. S. MAGUINNESS . . . . .	127
SOME EMENDATIONS IN LATE LATIN TEXTS. W. MOREL . . . . .	136
THE DIVISION OF PARTS AMONG THE ACTORS IN SOPHOCLES' OEDIPUS COLONEUS. E. B. CEADEL . . . . .	139
PINDAR, PYTHIANS, v. 15 ff. A. Y. CAMPBELL . . . . .	148
NOTES ON PLAUTUS. ERNST RIESS . . . . .	150
MARGINALIA SCENICA. II. J. JACKSON . . . . .	163
INDEXES . . . . .	188

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

HUMPHREY MILFORD: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Price for single numbers, 4s. net (4s. 2d. post free); for double numbers, 8s. net (8s. 4d. post free). Yearly subscrip-  
tion 16s. post free; U.S.A. \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and  
THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. post free; U.S.A., \$5.32.

*Th*  
*ha*  
*all*  
*ha*  
*be*  
*Do*



*The British Museum's set of the 'Classical Quarterly' has suffered by enemy action. It is possible to make up all numbers except Volume V, No. 4. If any subscriber has a spare copy of this number, the Publishers will be obliged if he will report to the Secretary to the Delegates, the Clarendon Press, Walton Street, Oxford.*

TH

In d  
even  
nomi  
of co  
the p  
two  
Thas  
it wa  
Eubo  
state  
in th  
two  
litera  
so fa  
Blak

<sup>1</sup> I  
Wade  
denta  
passag  
clear.

<sup>2</sup> A  
484. 1  
refere  
which  
the ne  
*Arch*  
able?

<sup>3</sup> G  
*Berl.*  
putat  
accur  
ham  
711 B  
eclips  
(11-72  
(Blak  
was '  
Paros

<sup>4</sup> F  
betwe  
See p  
<sup>5</sup> '.

*Poetr*  
<sup>6</sup> I  
the m  
nearl  
that

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY-OCTOBER 1941

## THE DATE OF ARCHILOCHOS<sup>1</sup>

IN determining the time of Archilochos it is useless to begin with the eclipse—an event which strongly appeals to the modern mind, as it seems open to exact astronomical and mathematical computation. Even granted from the first and as a matter of course that Archilochos saw the eclipse<sup>2</sup> and that it was total or nearly total in the place where he saw it, there are two objections: (1) the astronomical data for the two eclipses of 711 B.C. and 648 (or 647) B.C. are as yet insufficient even for Paros and Thasos;<sup>3</sup> (2) we do not know for certain where the eclipse poem was written: probably it was in Paros, as the speaker is Lykambes, but it may be Thasos, not to mention Euboia, Crete, or Sicily.<sup>4</sup> The whole thing is elusive, and Alan Blakeway,<sup>5</sup> when he stated the case for 711—perhaps 'too emphatically', as he concedes—is quite clear in this respect. The most he affirms is that 'there is nothing to choose between the two eclipses astronomically';<sup>6</sup> and what he asks for is a new examination of 'the literary evidence without that unconscious bias in favour of the 648 B.C. eclipse which so far has influenced it'.<sup>7</sup> That is quite a reasonable demand, and it is only with Blakeway's re-examination of the literary evidence that I find fault.

<sup>1</sup> I am exceedingly grateful to Professor H. T. Wade-Gery for checking my English and incidentally directing my attention to one or two passages where I made my opinion not sufficiently clear. The editors, too, helped considerably.

<sup>2</sup> Against e.g. J. B. Bury, *CAH* iv, 1926, 484. 1 (and others), 'It is more probable that the reference is to the eclipse of April 15th, 657 B.C., which was total in or near Rhodes and of which the news would have reached Paros (cp. Hauvette *Archiloque* 13 sqq.)'. Why is that more probable?

<sup>3</sup> Ginzel, *Spezieller Kanon*, 1899, 167; *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1918, no. 4. What we need is a computation for the eclipse of 648/7 B.C. of the same accuracy as the computation made by Fotheringham on behalf of Blakeway for the eclipse of 711 B.C., 14 March. According to Ginzel the eclipse of 648 was nearly, though not quite, total (11.72') at Paros; according to Fotheringham (Blakeway, 36) it was total, while in 711 B.C. it was 'total at Thasos and not far from total at Paros'. See n. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Practically, I believe, we have only to choose between Thasos and (more probably) Paros. See p. 107, n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> 'The date of Archilochos' in *Greek Life and Poetry*, 1936, pp. 34-55.

<sup>6</sup> loc. cit. p. 36. If he further states that 'at the most the eclipse of 711 B.C. approaches more nearly to the description of Archilochos than that of 648', I do not know whether he is right.

If *μεσημβρινή* is astronomically inaccurate, but an impressive poetical expression for the hour of the day or (as Archilochos had no clock) for the forenoon, a few minutes more or less do not matter much. More important is another consideration. Fotheringham gives 10.16 a.m. for the middle totality local solar time at Thasos in 711, 'which is nearer to midday than the time when the eclipse of 648 B.C. April 6th was total at Paros'. What time was that? In any case it seems to me that we should compare the middle totalities for Thasos for both eclipses on the one hand, and for Paros on the other. The question is not so much when and if the eclipse of 711 B.C. was total in Paros, but whether the eclipse of 648 B.C. failed to reach totality in Thasos or Paros. It may be added that the eclipse is only a *terminus post*, as the speaker in the eclipse poem F 74 is Lykambes: Archilochos may have seen the eclipse at Thasos, but the poem may have been composed (not so very much) later at Paros. To judge from the most valuable report of Kritias (Aelian, *VH* 10. 13 = *Vorsokr.* 88 [81] B 44) about the personality of Archilochos, the Neobule affair should be later than the emigration of the poet to Thasos; it belongs to the time when he had returned to his native island.

<sup>7</sup> loc. cit. 55. I am not sure that this statement is borne out by the facts. True that, e.g. Beloch, *Gr. G.* 2 i. 2. 350, called the eclipse 'the decisive testimony' and Wilamowitz, *Gr. Lit.* 3

Before examining the evidence ourselves we have to make a negative statement: as far as we know there is no documentary evidence either for Archilochos himself or, perhaps, for the colonization of Thasos, even if there existed a chronicle of Paros or something akin to it in the eighth or seventh century, which I am inclined to doubt. If there was, it may have noted the colonization(s) of Thasos, but it did not mention Archilochos. To be sure, Demeas, whether he is to be assigned to the fourth or the second century B.C., had at hand a Parian archon-list, and arranged the poems according to this list; but that is the work of a grammarian or a literary historian or a classical scholar, not Parian tradition;<sup>1</sup> and if we were possessed of an ancient work on the history of Paros and a complete edition of Archilochos' poems, we very probably should do the work better than he did. As it is, the remains of his book<sup>2</sup> do not help us, as we unfortunately cannot fix the Parian eponyms mentioned in it.

Our evidence is purely literary: it consists, first and foremost, if not (as the case seems to be here) exclusively, of the fragments of the poems; for the dates given by the ancient writers are drawn from the poems at a time when they were still complete.

In reviewing these data we are in for a rather sore disappointment: all our witnesses from Herodotos and Hippias down to the Alexandrian scholar Euphoriion and the Christian writers rely on one poem, and one poem only—the Gyges poem

1912, 30, said that 'his time is fixed by the mention of the eclipse of 648 B.C.', and others too expressed themselves in a similar manner. But they did so or have done so for the sake of brevity. In fact, the earlier scholars were influenced by the ancient date for Gyges which was wrong, and voted for the eclipse of 711 because it seemed to fit in with this date. Some of them even formally rejected the eclipse of 648 because they believed that a contemporary of Gyges could not have seen it. Only after Gelzer, *Rh. M.* xxx, 1875, 230ff., had established the true chronology of the Lydian kings from the Assyrian annals, were scholars driven to assume that the Archilochos eclipse was the eclipse of 648, because most of them quite rightly did not doubt that the eclipse was seen by Archilochos himself, and then 711 seemed much too early. Neither is there in my opinion much of a bias, conscious or unconscious, in the use of literary evidence by modern scholars. On the contrary, Blakeway seems to me to have a bias for the earlier date for reasons which he enumerates in the beginning of his paper (l.c. 34 f.), and strives to fit the literary evidence to this preconceived opinion. In doing so, I am afraid, his knowledge of the development, the manner, and the methods of ancient chronography is not quite up to date, as shown by the review of 'the external literary evidence' on p. 35, the treatment of it on pp. 39 ff., and even more by the summing up on pp. 54 ff., when he declares that the rejection of the two authorities Nepos and Eusebios (who, in fact, represent only one witness, viz. Apollodoros of Athens—*unus sed leo*) 'is a far smaller sacrifice of evidence' than the discarding of Cicero, Tatian, Cyril, Oinomaos, and Clement.

The valuation of sources here is wrong. Apparently Blakeway rejects, or at least fails to do justice to the very great progress made here by Gutschmid, Rohde, Diels, and (φορτικὸν τὸ ἀληθές) by me in the *Apollodoros* (*PhU* xvi, 1902) and the *FGrHist* i-ii (1923/30). As he does not quote the last-named books and only once mentions the 'ingenious and attractive theory of Rohde', with a very characteristic note (ll. 40, 2), I am inclined to believe that he consciously rejects their opinions as well as their method; and that he consciously renews what Crusius (*RE* ii, 1896, 489 f.) describes as 'die unkritischen vermittlungsversuche älterer gelehrter die Archilochos steinalt werden lassen, nur um alle ansätze der alten beibehalten zu können'. Further, in trying to fix the date of Archilochos, one cannot quite avoid 'embarking on the vexed problem of the chronology of the Lydian kings' (p. 44), even if one excludes detail which is not pertinent. Neither can one quite avoid taking into account the problem of relative chronology in Greek literary history between, say, 750 and 650, at least as far as it is concerned with the relations between Archilochos and Hesiod, Archilochos and Terpander, Archilochos and Kallinos.

<sup>1</sup> *PhU* xvi. 144. 3. Personally I believe that Demeas' dates for Archilochos are worth not much more than those of Sosikrates for Epimenides or Anacharsis, who came to Athens κατὰ τὴν μὲν Ὀλυμπιάδα ἐπ' ἀρχοντος Εὐκράτους (ibid. 168. 8).

<sup>2</sup> F 51 Diehl; Hiller von Gaertringen, *Noch einmal das Archilochosdenkmal von Paros*. *GGN* 1934.

F 2:  
only  
you

the  
deat  
prob  
take  
coin  
Eus  
of N  
chro  
Rom  
Hos  
Apo

1 I  
Πάρμ  
τριμέ  
ποτε  
"Ελλ  
vous,  
Chres  
"Αρχί  
"Αμό  
πράτο  
Home  
1. 117  
ἐν τῇ  
τῶν ἐ  
ρον ἰσ  
(F 23  
ὅς βα  
ὄν κα  
Olymp  
logical  
sios of  
FGrH  
10. 11.  
"Αρχί  
ἡκμασ  
Λυδόν,  
(490 ye  
The in  
Marm  
is rath  
tion of  
by Arc  
1311; c  
guessw  
2 St  
καὶ τὸ  
ἀρδην  
σαντος  
τῶν δ'  
Krame  
ὡς εὐρι  
κατορθ



F 22;<sup>1</sup> for the Magnesia poem F 19, as we shall call it for the sake of brevity, is used only for relative chronology, deciding the question whether Kallinos is older or younger than Archilochos.<sup>2</sup>

Now, the Gyges poem is, in fact, a good starting-point for us too. We know from the Annals of Esarhaddon and Assurbānīpal the true date of Gyges, in so far as his death belongs almost certainly to 652 B.C.<sup>3</sup> If we accept the conjectural but quite probable combination with the duration of his reign in the Greek sources,<sup>4</sup> we may take it that he reigned from about 687 to 652 B.C.; and it seems more than a mere coincidence that these are his years in the Lydian list in the introduction to the Eusebios chronicle.<sup>5</sup> It is very tempting to connect with this computation the date of Nepos<sup>6</sup> for Archilochos, which, in fact, is that of the most trustworthy ancient chronographer, Apollodoros:<sup>7</sup> *Archilochum autem Nepos Cornelius tradit Tullo Hostilio Romae regnante iam tunc fuisse poematis clarum et nobilem*. The reign of Tullus Hostilius extends from 672 to 640; and there is no doubt that we get the accurate Apollodorean year of Archilochos' *floruit* from Eusebios' *Canon* Ol. 29.1 (664/3 B.C.):

<sup>1</sup> Herodt. 1. 12. 2 Γύγης, τοῦ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ Πάριος, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον γενόμενος, ἐν ἰάμβωι τριμέτρωι ἐπεμνήσθη. Hippas, *FGrHist* 6 F 6 ὁβέ ποτε τοῦδε τοῦ ὀνόματος (sc. τύραννος) εἰς τοὺς Ἑλληνας διαδοθέντος κατὰ τοὺς Ἀρχιλόχου χρόνους, καθάπερ Ἰππίας ὁ σοφιστὴς φησιν. Proklos, *Chrest. Phot. Bibl.* 239, p. 319b27 ἰάμβων δὲ ποιηταὶ Ἀρχιλόχος τε ὁ Πάριος ἄριστος καὶ Σιμωνίδης ὁ Ἀμόργιος . . . καὶ Ἰππῶνας ὁ Ἐφέσιος, ὃν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος ἐπὶ Γύγῳ . . . ἤκαζεν. The synchronism Homer-Archilochos in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* 1. 117. 8/9: ναὶ μὴν Θεόπομπος (115 F 205) μὲν ἐν τῇ μὲν τῶν Φιλιππικῶν μετὰ ἑτῆ πεντακοσία τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰλίου στρατευσάντων γεγονέναι τὸν Ὀμηρον ἱστορεῖ. Εὐφορίων δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἀλεαδῶν (F 23 Scheidw.) κατὰ Γύγην αὐτὸν τίθησι γεγονέναι, ὃς βασιλεύειν ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τῆς 17 Ὀλυμπιάδος (708/4), ὃν καὶ φησι πρῶτον ὀνομάσθαι τύραννον (the Olympiad is added by Clement from his chronological handbook, probably the Χρόνοι of Dionysios of Halikarnassos; see infra, *Strom.* 1. 131. 7; *FGrHist* 251 F 3). Tatian, *ad Gr.* 31 (Euseb. *PE* 10. 11. 4) ἕτεροι δὲ κάτω τὸν χρόνον ὑπὲρ ἄγον, σὺν Ἀρχιλόχῳ τὸν Ὀμηρον εἰπόντες· ὁ δὲ Ἀρχίλοχος ἤκασε περὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα κγ' (688/5), κατὰ Γύγην τὸν Λυδόν, ὕστερον τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἑτεσι πεντακοσίους (490 years: Suda s.v. Σιμωνίδης Κρίνεια), and others. The introduction of Archilochos' name into the Marmor Parium (239 A 33 a. 681/0 or 682/1 B.C.) is rather dubious; to supply here the colonization of Thasos or (rather) a reinforcement led by Archilochos (Hiller von Gaertringen, *REVA* 1311; cf. *CAH* iii. 654 and others) is unprofitable guesswork.

<sup>2</sup> Strab. 14. 1. 40, p. 647/8 (from Kallisthenes) καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν δὲ συνβῆ τοῖς Μάγνησιν ὑπὸ Τρηῶν ἄρδην ἀναιρεθῆναι, Κιμμερικοῦ ἔθνους, ἔτυχε· αὐτοῖς (τὸς F; see p. 104, n. 4) πολλὸν χρόνον τῷ δ' ἐξῆς ἔτει Μιλησίους (τὸ δ' ἐξῆς Ἐφεσίους Kramer) κατασχέειν τὸν τόπον. Καλλίνος μὲν οὖν ὡς εὐτυχοῦντων ἐτι τῶν Μάγνητων μέμνηται καὶ κατορθούντων ἐν τῷ πρὸς τοὺς Ἐφεσίους πολέμῳ,

Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ ἦδη φαίνεται γνωρίζων τὴν γενομένην αὐτοῖς συμφορὰν "κλαῖω τὰ Θασίαν (Tzschucke, κλαῖειν θάσσαν Strabo) οὐ (Tyrwhit, οὐ Strabo) τὰ Μάγνητων κακὰ". ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ νεώτερον εἶναι τοῦ Καλλίνου τεκμαίρεσθαι πάρεστιν. ἄλλης δὲ τινας ἐφόδου τῶν Κιμμερίων μέμνηται πρεσβύτερος ὁ Καλλίνος, ἐπὶ φησὶ "τὸν δ' ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ὀβριμοεργῶν", ἐν τῇ τὴν Σάρδεων ἄλωσιν δηλοῖ (cf. Kallisthenes 124 F 29). The same, very much abbreviated, in Aristotle-Herakleides, *Pol.* 23. 1 and Athen. 12. 29, p. 525C (it is not necessary to discuss here the textual difficulties in the Strabo and Athenaios passages). A detailed discussion on the chronology of Archilochos which did not deal only with the Magnesian affair (misjudged by Blakeway, 50 f., who overlooked the καὶ) is abbreviated by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1. 131. 17 Σάνθος δὲ ὁ Λυδὸς περὶ τὴν 17 Ὀλυμπιάδα (708/4) —ὡς δὲ Διονύσιος (251 F 3) περὶ τὴν 16 (720/17)— θάσσαν ἐκτίσθαι, ὡς εἶναι συμφανὲς τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον μετὰ τὴν κ' ἦδη γνωρίζεσθαι Ὀλυμπιάδα (700/696)· μέμνηται γοῦν καὶ (!) τῆς Μάγνητων ἀπωλείας προσφάτως (that means 'recently') γεγενημένης. Σιμωνίδης (that is Semonides of Amorgos; see supra, n. 1) μὲν οὖν κατὰ Ἀρχίλοχον φέρεται, Καλλίνος δὲ πρεσβύτερος οὐ μακρῶν τῶν γὰρ Μάγνητων ὁ μὲν Ἀρχίλοχος ἀπολωλῶτων, ὁ δὲ εὐημερούντων μέμνηται.

<sup>3</sup> Gelzer, *Rh. M.* xxx, 1875, 230 ff.; Lehmann-Haupt, *RE* vii, 1912, 1956 ff.; Hogarth, *CAH* iii. 507. If not 652, then a little later; there is no need to go into the detail.

<sup>4</sup> 38 years in Herodotos, 36 in Africanus and in Eusebios' *Canon*, 35 in his introduction. This compromise is accepted by Hogarth, *CAH* iii. 501 and others.

<sup>5</sup> Preserved in the Armenian translation, p. 32 f. Karst. In the other sources Gyges' reign begins and ends earlier: 716–679 Herodotos, 698–663 Africanus (699–664 Eusebios in the *Canon*).

<sup>6</sup> Gellius, *NA* 17. 21. 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Phil. Unters.* xvi. 142; *FGrHist* 244 F 336.

*Archilochus et Simonides et Aristoxenus musicus illustres habentur.* We do not know the source from which Eusebios in his introduction took the Lydian list. But if we may trust it—and in any case there is no doubt about the year of Archilochos' *floruit*, as given by Nepos and Eusebios in the *Canon*—there is complete agreement between the Babylonian Annals and the date of Apollodoros; if not (that is, if the apparent agreement is a mere coincidence), we have to seek another explanation for the Apollodoros date, which, I repeat, is not open to doubt (it may be wrong, but that is another question). In this case, I suggest again that the experienced chronographer worked for his part with the relative chronology of musical history:<sup>1</sup> in his opinion Archilochos was later than Terpan-dros, and Terpan-dros was fixed for him by the Karneia list definitely in 676 B.C. This relative chronology is of the utmost importance and, if right, would settle the whole controversy. The considerations which determined the musical source of Apollodoros are quite clear and seem to be convincing. But, of course, our ancient authorities are not agreed even here, and, as the musical history is not literary evidence in the strict sense of the word, I shall not insist on this argument for a later date for Archilochos. In any case, Apollodoros makes Archilochos considerably younger than our other authorities; e.g. Cicero *Tusc.* 1. 3<sup>2</sup> *fuit Archilochus regnante Romulo* (753/16) or Clemens Alex. *Strom.* 1. 131, 7<sup>3</sup> *Ξάνθος δὲ ὁ Λυδὸς περὶ τὴν ὀκτωκαιδεκάτην ὀλυμπιάδα* (708/4)—ὡς δὲ Διονύσιος περὶ τὴν πεντεκαιδεκάτην (720/17)—Θάσον ἐκτίσθαι, ὡς εἶναι συμφανὲς τὸν Ἀρχιλόχον μετὰ τὴν εἰκοστὴν ἤδη (700/696) γνωρίζεσθαι ὀλυμπιάδα.

<sup>1</sup> *PhU* xvi. 148. The authority for Apollodoros is almost certainly the work *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* by Glaukos of Rhegion whom he quotes also for the life of Empedokles (244 F 32). About Glaukos see Jacoby, *RE* vii, 1912, col. 1417, no. 36; his outline of musical history col. 1419 f.; cf. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium*, 1904, 54 f.; 98 f. He was a practising musician, probably a flute-player, who lived (partly at least in Athens) about 400 B.C. As an authority he is used by Herakleides of Pontos in his *Συναγωγή τῶν ἐν μουσικῇ*, and through him found his way into Plutarch's treatise *Περὶ μουσικῆς*. The pertinent passage for the chronological question is ch. 4, p. 1132E *ἔοικε δὲ κατὰ τὴν τέχνην τὴν κιθαρωδικὴν ὁ Τέρπανδρος διετηνοχέαι . . . καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις δὲ σφόδρα παλαιὸς ἐστὶν πρεσβύτερον γοῦν αὐτὸν Ἀρχιλόχου ἀποφαίνει Γλαῦκος ὁ ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἐν συγγράμματι τινι Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ μουσικῶν φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν δεύτερον γεγονέναι μετὰ τοὺς πρῶτους ποιήσαντας αὐλωιδίαν (αὐλητικὴν Westphal); cf. ch. 5, p. 1133A *Κλονᾶς δέ, ὁ τῶν αὐλωδικῶν νόμων ποιητὴς ὁ ὀλίγωι ὕστερον Τερπάνδρου γενόμενος . . . μετὰ δὲ Τέρπανδρον καὶ Κλονᾶν Ἀρχιλόχος παραδίδεται γενέσθαι*. As Glaukos stood up for flute-music, we do not expect him to date Terpan-dros earlier than necessary. We do not know whether Hellanikos, who published the chronicle of the Karneia (4 F 85/6), was of the same opinion as Glaukos; but at least he called him the 'very first' victor at the Karneia (which were instituted in the 26th Olympiad = 676/3 B.C.; again the Olympiad is a later addition, which is expressly ascribed to Sosibios the*

Laconian's *Περὶ χρόνων*) and dated him *κατὰ Μίδαν*. Midas reigned according to Eusebios from c. 738 till 696, and the Assyrian Annals confirm this date (Eitrem, *RE* xv, 1931, 1538, no. 3; Ed. Meyer, *GdA*<sup>2</sup> iii, 1937, 35); that is, he began earlier than Gyges even in the wrong lists. Therefore it is probable that Hellanikos too thought Terpan-dros the older man of the two. Certain it is for Hieronymos *Περὶ κιθαρωιδῶν*, who dated Terpan-dros *κατὰ Λυκούργον τὸν νομοθέτην*. On the other hand, Phainias of Eresos (Clemens, *Strom.* 1. 131. 6) made him *Ἀρχιλόχου νεώτερον*. Possibly the author of the Parian Marble did so too, if in A 33 a. 681/0 we introduce the rather dubious supplement [*Ἀρχιλόχ]ο[ς]*; for Terpan-dros, the inventor of the νόμοι κιθαρωιδικοί, who τὴν ἐμπροσθεν μουσικὴν μετέστησεν, he dates (A 34) very late in 644/3 (a date which we find also in Eusebios' *Canon*, *sub* Ol. 34. 4; 641/0). For a possible explanation see Jacoby, *Marm. Par.* 189; *FGH* ii. D, p. 686. I would have suggested parochialism on his part, if it were not for Phainias, whom we should expect to stand up for his Lesbian countryman. Sohe, too, may have given reasons drawn from musical history; but we do not know what they were.

<sup>2</sup> From Varro?

<sup>3</sup> It is Clement, not Xanthos or Dionysios, who infers the time of Archilochos from the date of the colonization of Thasos. If there are 20 years between the two dates, he knew from Kritias that Archilochos emigrated to Thasos as a young man. I cannot agree with Blakeway, 50 f., at all.

While we are, perhaps, not quite sure of the reasons Apollodoros had for his computation, these earlier dates are easy to explain: Archilochos is a contemporary of Gyges, and Gyges begins to reign according to Herodotos in 716, and according to Africanus in 696 or according to Eusebios in the *Canon* in 699.<sup>1</sup> While for us (and possibly also for Apollodoros) the synchronism of the poet with the Lydian king is a sure guide to his true chronology, for all ancient chronographers (with, perhaps, this one exception) it was, on the contrary, the cause of grievous faults, because their Mermnad list began from fifteen to thirty years too early.

The upshot of this rather short discussion of the ancient evidence, which I have tried to keep free of irrelevant detail, is the following: all ancient computations rely on the synchronism Archilochos-Gyges; and this synchronism brings the activity of Archilochos, either wholly or partly, into the middle third of the seventh century—about the year Apollodoros gives for his *floruit*, viz. 664/3 B.C.

Now I grant that it is not *a priori* impossible that Archilochos was about 60 years old when he wrote the Gyges poem, as it is not *a priori* impossible that he was 70 when he was 'slain in battle'.<sup>2</sup> That the suggestion is probable I cannot bring myself to believe, judging from the character of his poems, which, without exception, show us a man in the prime of life, not an 'aged marshal'.<sup>3</sup> I cannot regard the old and venerable chronology of an Archilochos living between 740/30 and 670/60 as anything but the consequence of a certain lack of acquaintance with the means, the manner, and the methods of ancient chronography. As things are, the question we have to put to ourselves is, whether there is anything against a date for Archilochos which includes, either wholly or partly, the reign of Gyges (687/52) and therefore probably the eclipse of 648—and in putting this question we have to take very seriously the arguments of Blakeway, enumerated in the beginning of his paper.<sup>4</sup> In other words, are there (in the light of Blakeway's arguments) any reasons for asserting that Archilochos must have lived and composed as early as the second half of the eighth century?

In my opinion—and it is given with due reserve—there is no reason at all. Neither the historical facts (taken from 'a study of Greek colonization in the West' or from 'a study of the so-called Lelantine war' or the dates for the colonization of Thasos) nor the 'historical' allusions in the fragments (the Magnesia Poem F 19, the eclipse poem F 74, the Eubolia poems F 3, and possibly F 56,<sup>5</sup> the Syracuse poem F 145 Bgk.,

<sup>1</sup> Again there is no need to go into detail, as these authorities are all agreed on the last decades of the eighth or the first years of the seventh centuries. But it may be remarked that Eusebios' *Canon* puts the *floruit* of Archilochos (together with the other iambographers Semonides and Aristoxenos) in the very last year of Gyges 664 B.C. It is quite on the cards that this, too, is the doctrine of Apollodoros employing the usual artifice of assigning the *floruit* of a literary man, for whom an accurate date was not available, to the first, the middle, or the last year of a contemporary political personage and thereby not only upholding the old synchronism Archilochos-Gyges, but removing the poet as far as possible under this synchronism from Terpander. The expounder of Homer and many other poetical texts had sense enough to see that it was extremely improbable that the Gyges poem should date from the beginning of the king's reign. <sup>2</sup> See p. 107, n. 4; 108, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> He was, in accordance with his social stand-

ing, no marshal at all, but a simple 'son of Mars' (*θεράπων Ἐνναλίου ἄνακτος*), as he was no founder of a colony (see *infra*, p. 102 f.). What I mean (and it is nothing new) is quite distinct from Blakeway's mention (p. 55, n. 1) of the 'modernity' of Archilochos. This so-called modernity should, in fact, not be used to date the poet as late as possible. So far I quite agree with Blakeway. But if other signs point to a later time, it may be taken into account. The question does not reflect so much on Archilochos as on Hesiod, who cannot very well have lived much later than in the last third of the eighth century. The tradition about the death of Amphidamas in the Lelantine war (*infra*, p. 107 f.)—Plutarch, *Sept. Sap. Conv.* 10, p. 153E; Schol. Hes. *Opp.* 648, p. 304 Gaisford (see *Hesiodi Carmina* rec. Jacoby, i. 119)—is possibly a corroboration of this date. Hesiod's poems were well known to Archilochos.

<sup>4</sup> p. 34 f.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 108, n. 1.

the Thasian poems which we had better call the Oinomaos evidence)<sup>1</sup> oblige us to put back the birth of Archilochos to the eighth century, and still less convincing is the view which throws it back almost to the middle of this century.

I exclude without more ado the 'trivial episode', as Blakeway himself calls it, 'of Aithiops the Corinthian who bartered away his κλῆρος in Sicily for a honey-cake on the voyage to Syracuse'.<sup>2</sup> If we date the colonization of Syracuse with Blakeway as in 734 B.C., an Archilochos born 740/30 was a small child, if alive at all, at the time the thing happened. He was no eyewitness to it, but must have heard of it by oral tradition. That disposes at once of the argument that the episode 'surely implies by its very triviality, that Archilochos was close in time to the event he narrates'. It would make sense, perhaps, to assert that such a trivial story would only be mentioned by a man on the spot; but it makes no sense to assume that a story which was told, say, twenty years after the event, could not have been re-told after forty or fifty; in other words, that it could not have been added to the well-filled treasure-house of anecdotes, possibly in proverb form ('you are like Aithiops who...'), the more so since it belongs to a known type, being an instance of a certain type of improvident men.<sup>3</sup>

We can deal almost as shortly with Archilochos and the colonization of Thasos. There is no need here to examine the whole tradition, if tradition it is, about the colonization itself, nor to compare and explain the dates given for it by Xanthos and others.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Infra*, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> Athen. 4. 63, p. 167D τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο καὶ Αἰθίοψ ὁ Κορινθίος, ὡς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Σκῆψιος, ὃν μνημονεύει Ἀρχιλόχος (F 145 Bgk.). ὑπὸ φιληδονίας γὰρ καὶ ἀκρασίας καὶ οὗτος μετ' Ἀρχίου πλέων εἰς Σικελίαν, ὅτ' ἐμελλεν κτίζειν Συρακούσας, τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σουσούται μελιτοῦττης ἀπέδοτο τὸν κλῆρον, ὃν ἐν Συρακούσας λαχὼν ἐμελλεν ἔχειν.

<sup>3</sup> For the proverb ὁ τοῦ ὄνου δίψος, where the ass barter away the Zeus-given φάρμακον γήρωσ ἀμυντήριον for a drink of water, Aelian, *NA* 6. 51, quotes the Sicilians Ibykos and Deinolochos, Sophokles and two comic poets. Archilochos illustrates the same sort of mind by an historical example. Thousands of men retold or alluded to the story of Esau (*Gen.* xxv. 27–34), who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. I am sure there are more parallels in the collections of the Greek proverbs.

<sup>4</sup> The date given by Xanthos we cannot recover, as we do not know how he expressed it. We are in the same predicament for the dates of Hellanikos, Theopompos, and Euphron (p. 99, n. 1; p. 103, n. 1), or those of Demeas (p. 98, n. 1), and many others. Probably he gave the year of a Lydian king, which the source of Clement converted into an Olympiad, which is of no use to us. Dionysios gives another Olympiad, which makes it quite clear that either there was no real tradition (*PhU* xvi. 144. 3) or the chronographers were not able to fix the Parian eponym. The tradition about the colonization is also rather slight: the founder, according to an oracle (Oinom. Euseb. *PE* 6. 7. 8; Steph. Byz. s. *Θάσος*) is one Telesikles, father of the

poet in the epigram on the Parian Archilochos monument. Thasian tradition, if tradition there was, we should expect from the Thasian Polygnotos (Pausan. 10. 28. 3), who, strictly speaking (and Blakeway, p. 49. 2, stresses the point), did not paint the colonization, but the introduction of the Demeter-cult by Kleobolia, wife of Tellis, who also appears in the picture ἡλικίαν ἐφήβου γεγονώς. This Tellis is, according to the source of Pausanias (Polemon)—he says ἡκουσα—grandfather of the poet. Accordingly Blakeway thinks of pre-colonization contacts between Paros and Thasos, while Hiller von Gaertringen believes that Polemon wrongly differentiated between Tellis and Telesikles. As to the date, Blakeway, p. 53, puts the colonization at 720 B.C., the date of Dionysios, which is rather early, to judge from the excavations at Limenia (see Blakeway 51. 1 on the authority of Miss E. Haspels: 'The French excavations have produced a fair quantity of Greek pottery of the first half of the 7th century <see *A.A.* 47, 165; 48, 244>, and a little which can perhaps <?> be referred to the end of the 8th'); Hiller at 682/0, which seems to be too late and is founded on his more than doubtful supplement of *Marm. Par.* A 33. If the ancient dates are about right, that is, if Thasos was colonized between 720 and 700, the leader of the colonists may very well have been the grandfather of the poet. It should be remembered that the oracle says nothing about a son of the founder; it simply tells Telesikles to inform the Parians of its order to colonize Thasos. I have not much doubt as to the authenticity of the oracle; the attendant circumstances are



It is true, Oinomaos in a rather verbose passage<sup>1</sup> implies that Archilochos 'played some part in the foundation of the colony'. But the value of his evidence is very slight. He says (and I believe we can trust him so far) that Archilochos called Thasos 'Heríē, and Blakeway is very right when he asserts 'Hería is in fact a fragment of Archilochos'. He might have added that Oinomaos fishes out this fragment to explain the obscure direction of the oracle "ἀγγειλον Παρίους, Τελεσίκλεες, ὥς σε κελεύω | νῆσωι ἐν 'Heríē κτίζειν εὐδείελον ἄστυ". But that is the only advantage to be drawn from the passage. For if Παρίους ἐξενάγησεν means the participation of Archilochos in the enterprise of his father, then Oinomaos, far from depending for 'the whole story of the colonization' on 'the best of all possible sources, Archilochos himself', has either drawn a wrong inference or (what is more likely) simply confused different things, the tradition about Archilochos' father Telesikles founding Thasos—a tradition which probably existed in his time—and Archilochos coming later on to the same colony. We do not know in which connexion the poet called Thasos 'Heríē, and it is not necessary for us to know it in order to reject a poem about the Θάσον κτίσις and particularly the conclusion 'that the poet had reached manhood before the foundation of Thasos'.<sup>2</sup> For we are quite sure from a source which, if not the best, is at least a very good one, viz. Kritias<sup>3</sup> (who not only knew the poems perfectly but expressly referred to them), that the poet was not the founder or co-founder of Thasos, but that the son of a slave-woman left Paros for Thasos at some time of his life διὰ πενίαν καὶ ἀπορίαν. At the utmost we may believe that he did not go alone, but was an item in a reinforcement of the colony by Paros. But it is a far cry from emigration to the heroic task of the founding of a colony, of leading the colonists.

We should have to deal more circumstantially with the Magnesia poem, which was not a poem about Magnesia, but a mention in one of the poems about Thasos of the evils which had once or more often overtaken Magnesia, if we were out for historical

of no great interest, and before Oinomaos nobody knows anything about the participation of Archilochos. Blakeway's compromise—'there is no need to take Παρίους ἐξενάγησεν as implying that Oinomaos thought that Archilochos was leader of the colony; ἐξενάγησεν means no more than 'acted as a guide'—seems to me neither helpful nor probable.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. PE 6. 7. 8 (text of the oracle) ἀγγελῶ, νῆ Δία (φήσει τάχα πού τις τετυφωμένος ἢ σὲ ἐλέγχαν), κἂν μὴ κελεύσῃς· πέπρωται γάρ. καὶ ἔστι Θάσος μὲν ἡ 'Hería νῆσος· ἤξουσι δ' ἐπ' αὐτὴν Πάριοι, 'Αρχιλόχου τοῦ ἐμοῦ υἱοῦ φράσαντος ὅτι ἡ νῆσος αὕτη πρὶν 'Hería ἐκαλεῖτο. σὺ οὖν, δεινὸς γὰρ ἐξελεῖν, οὐκ ἀνέζηι (οἰμαί) αὐτοῦ οὕτως ὄντος ἀχαρίστου καὶ θρασέως, ὅς, εἰ μὴ σὺ μνηύσαι αὐτῷ ἐβουλήθης, οὐκ ἂν ποτε ἤγγειλεν, οὐδ' ἂν 'Αρχιλόχος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Παρίους ἐξενάγησεν, οὐδ' ἂν οἱ Πάριοι Θάσον ὠίκησαν.

<sup>2</sup> This conclusion of Blakeway rests, as far as I understand it, on a combination of Oinomaos' ἐξενάγησεν and the dates given by Clement—two very different premises. In fact, Clement does not say anything about a participation of Archilochos in the colonization of Thasos, but his source, in trying to determine the date of the poet (see p. 99, n. 1), takes the colonization as a *terminus post* for the birth of Archilochos, who—as the poems show and Kritias confirms—

was not a child when he wrote the Thasian poems: hence γνωρίζεσθαι. Even if Archilochos wrote a poem such as Blakeway imagines, it does not follow that he was an adult at the time of the colonization. There were, surely, many opportunities in the Thasian poems or elsewhere, to mention the foundation (see e.g. F 54?), either shortly, as he mentioned the Μαγνήτων κακά (see p. 107), or even at some length in the elegies. But we have no authority for it, and I am sure that if he had given more than the name we should hear of it: the ancient grammarians looked for historical facts in the poets very carefully. Strabo 10. 5. 7 knows nothing but the bare fact of the Parian colonization, and Pausanias (10. 28. 3) only knows what the picture by Polygnotus gave; to explain it he has recourse to an ἡκουσα, and what he 'heard' refers only to the genealogy of the poet. I personally do not believe in a more or less historical poem by Archilochos.

<sup>3</sup> Aelian, VH 10. 13 = *Vorsoke*. 88 [81] B 44 εἰ γὰρ μὴ (φησιν) ἐκεῖνος τοιαύτην δόξαν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἤνεγκεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐπιθόμεθα ἡμεῖς οὔτε ὅτι Ἐνπιδὺς υἱὸς ἦν τῆς δούλης οὐδ' ὅτι καταλιπὼν Πάρον διὰ πενίαν καὶ ἀπορίαν ἦλθεν εἰς Θάσον οὐδ' ὅτι ἐλθὼν τοῖς ἐνταῦθα ἐχθρὸς ἐγένετο κτλ. Cf. Pindar, P 2. 54 εἶδον γὰρ ἐκάς ἔων ἐν ἀμαχανίαι | ψογερόν 'Αρχιλόχον βαρυλόγους ἔχθεσιν πταινόμενον.

results and the history of the Greek towns in Asia Minor in the first half of the seventh century.<sup>1</sup> But we are not; our task is restricted to the chronology of Archilochos. Now, the phrase *Μαγνήτων κακά* in itself is not a very good guide in this respect: the 'Woes of Magnesia' seem at the first blush to have been so manifold that the expression may be thought to have become a proverbial one already, at the time when the poet lived in Thasos and complained of the situation in the island which was overhung by the *Ταντάλου λίθος*.<sup>2</sup> A closer examination reveals that things were not so bad as they appear. True, there was a series of wars with an unknown enemy, with Gyges, with the Ephesians, with the barbarians from the north; but not all these wars can be termed *κακά* in the sense in which Archilochos uses the phrase. Taken in chronological order the evidence is this:

(1) Pliny<sup>3</sup> tells us of a *Bularchi pictoris tabula, in qua erat Magnetum proelium*, which Kandaules, who reigned from about 702 to about 685,<sup>4</sup> bought for a fabulous

<sup>1</sup> Then we should have to ask whether any of the passages quoted could refer to Magnesia at the Sipylus, which I do not believe. As it is, I have simply collected all events which Archilochos might possibly have thought of. Buerchner's article on Magnesia on the Maeander (*RE* xiv. 471, no. 2) is, as usual, quite insufficient. The town at the Sipylus is usually distinguished from the Maeandrian by an epithet (Hellanikos 4 F 191 and others).

<sup>2</sup> F 55. Even if the *Μαγνήτων κακά* were already used proverbially in Archilochos' time (Hudson-Williams, *The Elegies of Theognis*, p. 262; Geffcken, *Gr. Lit.-Gesch.* i, 1926, 72, and others), it certainly would not mean that we can bring down 'indefinitely' the poem in which he uses the phrase. So far I agree with Blake-way, p. 45. 3; and the more so, as not even Theognis 603/4 and 1103/4 are sufficient proof for proverbial use: they adapt, after the manner of the 'Theognideans', an elegiac poem by Kallinos to a moral maxim. They do not restrict themselves to Magnesia, but (1103/4) join with it other towns famous or infamous for luxurious living. The real question is not how far to bring the poem down, but how far the event alluded to by Archilochos may be brought up. I feel confident that it was not a 'Queen Anne is dead' or 'Charlemagne has lost a back tooth' sort of allusion; and again I find myself in virtual agreement with Blakeway, who believes 'that Archilochos' poem followed soon after the event' and protests against an interpretation like the one sometimes proposed: 'I weep for the miseries that beset my own time and country, not for proverbial sufferings of far away and long ago.' In such an interpretation the 'long ago' at least is, in fact, a gratuitous addition.

<sup>3</sup> *NH* 35. 55 *quid? quod in confesso perinde est Bularchi (-achi B-iarchi V) pictoris tabulam, in qua erat Magnetum proelium, a Candaule rege Lydiae Heraclidarum novissimo, qui et Myrsilus vocitatus est, repensam auro? tanta iam dignatio picturae erat. circa Romuli id aetatem acciderit*

*necesse est: (et) enim duodevicensima olympiade (708/4) interit Candaules aut, ut quidam tradunt, eodem anno quo Romulus (716), nisi fallor, manifestata iam tunc claritate artis, adeo absolute. 7. 126 Candaules rex Bularchi picturam Magnetum exitii, haud mediocris spatii [pari (del. Mayhoff)] rependit auro.*

<sup>4</sup> The true date for Kandaules seems to dispose of some doubts about the authenticity of the whole story, as 'a Greek "battle-piece" picture in the first quarter of the 7th century is archaeologically perfectly possible' (Blake-way, p. 46, quoting Payne, *Protokorinth. Vasen-malerei*, pl. 10, nos. 1, 5, 6). Evidence for the third (hardly for the second) quarter is extant. Archaeology, as Paul Jacobsthal informs me, (Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung*, §§ 528, 535, 538) can hardly decide whether *proelium* or *exitium* is right. If the pinax was worth the gold king Kandaules paid for it, it was probably not so poor a picture as those on the Protokorinthian aryballois of 700-675 B.C. to which Blakeway refers, even if it was just a fight. If it was the sack of Magnesia, Bularchos could easily build it up with the material provided by the Phoenician silver bowls and the like which were well within his horizon: on them one sees not only lively battle-scenes but also pictures of beleaguered towns, etc. Should not the fight on the Chigi vase, painted in the third quarter of the century, follow the same models rather than reflect large wall-paintings, as Payne l. l. 14, suggests? But the rules of *Textkritik* obviously favour the *proelium* of the main passage against the *exitium* in the short and probably additional notice in the 7th book. I do not propose to change *exitium* into *exercitium* because I believe that Pliny (in hastily adding to the section *artibus excellentes* this oldest example from the main passage in book 35 or in abbreviating the extract he had made for it) confused the motif of the picture with the much better known and often quoted *Μαγνήτων κακά*—surely an excusable error. Blakeway, of course, prefers *exitium*,

price. Owing to the carelessness of Pliny we do not know against whom the Magnesians were fighting, and the variant *pichuram Magnetum exitii*, being only a variant, does not provide certainty as to the upshot of the war. The event, even if one does not doubt the authority of the Bularchos story—and I do not see a convincing reason for doubting it—remains rather obscure; but if Bularchos glorified the battle, it may even have been a Magnesian victory.

(2) Nikolaos of Damaskos<sup>1</sup> (who besides the short survey of Herodotos had a most valuable source for Lydian history, viz. Xanthos the Lydian) relates that Gyges *πολλάκις μὲν εἰς τὴν Μαγνήτων γῆν ἐνέβαλεν, τέλος δὲ καὶ χειροῦται τὴν πόλιν*. The story about the treatment of Magnes, the Smyranean poet<sup>2</sup> and musician who was man-handled by the Magnesians, *ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἔπεισιν ἤσεν Λυδῶν ἀριστεῖαν ἐν ἵππομαχίαι πρὸς Ἀμαζόνας, αὐτῶν δὲ οὐδὲν ἐμνήσθη*, may be (it need not be) anecdotal, but surely it does not discredit the fact, which is in complete agreement with Lydian policy since the accession of Gyges, that it was Gyges who took Magnesia and added it to his realm. Only, there is no word in Nikolaos about a destruction of the town, which would have been contrary to Lydian interests and without a parallel in the quite well-known history of the relations existing between Lydia and the Greeks. As Magnesia shared the fate of other Greek cities, there is no apparent reason for Archilochos' singling it out; and I do not think that it is in any way plausible to refer the *Μαγνήτων κακὰ* to the subjection of the town by Lydia.<sup>3</sup>

(3) There is in Strabo<sup>4</sup> a war between Magnesia and Ephesos, in which the which he does 'not for a moment believe wrong' —'strong words, strong words sir, said the black gentleman'. He does not weigh the claims of *proelium* and the probability of the main passage being more trustworthy for the detail, but spurns logic with the assertion that 'even if *exitium* is wrong, we have this body of evidence for Woes of Magnesia before the accession of Gyges'. There is no 'Woe', if *proelium* is right, which possibly even means a victory. I am very much inclined to believe that Bularchos painted the Amazon war, which afterwards Magnes sang (*infra*, n. 2); and there is nothing in our evidence to support a destruction of Magnesia by Kandaules or anybody. On the contrary, Strabo 14. 10. 40 (see p. 99, n. 2) knows only one *συμφορά*, which means the same event as *ἀπώλεια* in the Clement passage (see p. 99, n. 2). Perhaps he even positively excludes a former destruction: *εὐτυχίσαντος*, said of the Treres, is rather curious; much better the *εὐτυχίσαντας πολλὸν χρόνον* of codex F, referring to *συνέβη τοῖς Μάγνησιν ἄρδην ἀναιρεθῆναι* and looking forward to the following *εὐτυχούντων*. It is grammatically tolerable, and I prefer it to the obvious correction into *εὐτυχίσασιν*; the accusative would explain the corruption into the seemingly logical *εὐτυχίσαντος*. It is a conclusion *e silentio*, and I only give it for what it is worth. But in any case, Clement, who, according to Blakeway 'obviously thought of the destruction of Magnesia as being not far removed from 700 B.C.' (the italics are mine) cannot be claimed as supporting an *exitium* at so early a time; and Blakeway himself (p. 50 f.) is not happy about the text which, nevertheless, he used also for reconstructing the poem about the colonization of Thasos.

<sup>1</sup> *FGrHist* 90 F 62; Commentary ii C, pp. 233 ff.; 239 ff.; 244 ff. If Blakeway had read the *Fragmente*—but the pertinent fact was known long before, viz. that Nikolaos drew on a good source of a clearly epichorial character and had access to the Lydian court journals which gave detailed accounts about the exploits of the kings—he would, perhaps, not have relegated this piece of evidence to a note, as being 'in itself, without support from a better authority, not of much value'. But his suggestion of filling up one of the many gaps in the Lydian history of Herodotos (1. 14. 4) from it (not so much from Theognis 1103/4) seems to me a sound one.

<sup>2</sup> One might be inclined to doubt the name of the Smyranean poet, as the *Excerpta* are rather unreliable in this respect and full of confusions. I do not believe in what Crusius, *RE* ii. 489, tries to elicit from the vague words of the Latin metrist Juba, *De Archilochō Parīo, qui Gygae fabulam optime complexus est* (briefly but rightly rejected by Bergk, *PLGr* ii. 439): Archilochos and a poem of his making fun of the Magnesian (*sic*) colleague, as the source of Nikolaos.

<sup>3</sup> Incidentally, as we know from F 22 that Archilochos lived in (or after) the reign of Gyges, and as the Nikolaos war is not assigned to a certain year or period in this reign, it would, in any case, not add much to our knowledge of the poet's date.

<sup>4</sup> 14. 1. 40. The source is obviously the same passage of Kallisthenes (124 F 29) which he quotes, 13. 4. 8, for the captures of Sardes by

Magnesians were victorious. This war may have taken place before the subjection of the city by Gyges or after, as the incorporation with the Lydian kingdom did not exclude squabbles and even wars between the single Greek towns; but to a victory of Magnesia the *Μαγνήτων κακά* certainly cannot refer.

(4) Lastly there is the attack on Magnesia by the Treres, a Cimmerian tribe; and here we have, without the many doubts which beset the Bularchos painting, what the Archilochian phrase seems to imply—not an everyday misfortune, but a terrible fate, unique even in the calamities which the repeated invasions by the barbarians brought over the Ionian towns: the city was utterly destroyed, it simply disappeared, so that its old enemy Ephesos could occupy its territory.<sup>1</sup> Archilochos was not the only one who was greatly impressed by this change of fortune; Kallinos, the Ephesian poet, whose *Λόγος πρὸς Δία* prayed for the help of the gods for his own town,<sup>2</sup> mentioned it too; perhaps triumphantly or at least with a note of sober satisfaction,<sup>3</sup> and possibly with the secondary idea of justifying the action taken by the Ephesians. They weathered the storm<sup>4</sup> and did not, or could not, help Magnesia, but on the contrary made capital out of the disaster of their countrymen and neighbours. There is no need to try and write a history of the Cimmerian wars;<sup>5</sup> no need to discuss again the rather probable assumption that Magnesia fell in the same invasion which saw the capture of Sardes and the death of Gyges in 652 B.C. or a few years later. But it is sheer prejudice when Blakeway—knowing very well that Strabo's testimony 'would be decisive' for the date of Archilochos—asserts that 'there are good reasons for supposing that Strabo was mistaken in identifying the Woes of Magnesia in the Archilochos poem with the destruction of that city by the Trerians'.<sup>6</sup> There is no reason at all, let alone good ones. Apart from the fact that it is not Strabo speaking

Cimmerians, Treres, and Lycians. The passage shows that Kallisthenes was acquainted with the elegies of Kallinos, and that long before Strabo the grammarians (Demetrios of Skepsis is quoted here) discussed the bearing which the historical and chronological questions of the Cimmerian invasions had upon the relative date of the poets who mentioned them. Kallisthenes dealt with the ancient history of the Greek cities in Asia Minor in his *Ἀλεξάνδρον πράξεις*. For an episode from this or these wars see Aelian, *VH* 14. 46.

<sup>1</sup> Athen. 12. 29, p. 525C; Strabo, 14. 1. 40 (see p. 104, n. 4).

<sup>2</sup> F 2-4 D. *Σμυρναῖους* (= *Ἐφεσίοις*) δ' ἐλέησον | μνησάι δ' εἰ κοτέ τοι μηρία καλὰ βοῶν (Σμυρναῖοι κατέκταν) | νῦν δ' ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ὀβριμοεργῶν | Τρήρας ἄνδρας ἄγων. There are striking likenesses, not noted by Hudson-Williams, to this *Λόγος πρὸς Δία* (Strabo 14. 1. 4) in the prayers with which the second 'Theognis' of Megara (Jacoby, *Sb. Berlin*, 1931, 138 ff.) opens his book: *Ζεὺς μὲν τῆσδε πόλῃς ὑπερέχοι* (757)—*Φοῖβε ἀναξ . . . αὐτὸς δὲ στρατὸν ὕβριστήν Μήδων ἀπέρυκε τῆσδε πόλιν, ἵνα σοι λαοὶ . . . κλειτὰς πέμπωσ' ἐκατόμβας* (773 ff.) κτλ.

<sup>3</sup> Athen. 12. 29 ἀπώλοντο δὲ καὶ Μάγνητες οἱ πρὸς τῷ Μαϊάνδρῳ διὰ τὸ πλέον ἀνεθῆναι, ὡς φησι Καλλίνος ἐν τοῖς Ἑλεγείοις. This elegy 'Theognis' condenses in his couplet 603/4 (see p. 104, n. 2). It is astonishing that even Bergk did not see that this is a fragment of Kallinos, but only quotes

the passage in his note on F 3. On the luxury (?) of the Magnesian aristocracy Aelian, *VH* 14. 46.

<sup>4</sup> They were attacked by Lygdamis, and the great temple of Artemis was burnt down (Kallimachos, *H.* 3. 251 ff.; Hesych. s. *Λύγδαμης*). Is he the subject of Kallinos F 4 *Τρήρας ἄνδρας ἄγων*? see Strabo 1. 3. 21 *Λύγδαμης δὲ τοὺς αὐτοῦ ἄγων μέχρι Λυδίας καὶ Ἰωνίας ἤλασε καὶ Σάρδεας εἰλεν, ἐν Κιλικίᾳ δὲ διεφθάρη*.

<sup>5</sup> The evidence (see Busolt, *Gr. G.* 2 ii. 461 ff.) is slender for all detail, and, to judge from Strabo, there was not much more to be got from the complete elegies of Kallinos, which the grammarians used for determining the relative chronology of Kallinos and Archilochos. Obviously there was nothing at all to be got from the latter; if there had been more than the short allusion to the Magnesian Woes, the verses would have been quoted in the discussion.

<sup>6</sup> It is curious what different standards Blakeway applies to the sources: he finds no difficulty in crediting the learned Strabo (who, in fact, represents here Kallisthenes and the best Hellenistic science) with an incredible confusion and extreme carelessness, but he cannot bring himself to believe (p. 55) that Clement, who in all secular subject-matter is a mere compiler, 'was mistaken in his dating of Archilochos' reference to the fall of Magnesia'. In fact, Clement dated it with Strabo.



but Kallisthenes, who had the elegies of Kallinos at hand and who, as his narration of the Messenian wars attests, knew how to use poems as historical sources; apart also from the clear testimony of Kallinos about the fate of Magnesia—the evidence we have collected shows that, as far as we know, and, what is more important, as far as the ancient historians knew, there is one and only one fact in the history of Magnesia between about 700 and 650 B.C. which fits the phrase used by Archilochos. Now, we cannot date the destruction of the town, implied by the phrase, more accurately than by putting it in the second half of the fifties, although 652 is, to say the least, very probable. But it really does not matter much for our question whether it was a few years earlier or later. In any case, the event which Archilochos alludes to was a recent one, as fresh in the memory of men as the name of Gyges and most of the names as well as events in Archilochos' poems; and an unbiased observer will believe, until the contrary is proved, that the poem was written not much later than 652.<sup>1</sup> Instead of being 'valueless as a proof that Archilochos was alive after 650 B.C.'<sup>2</sup> the short allusion to the Woes of Magnesia should be of the utmost importance for the chronology of the poet. If, in a Thasian poem, he alludes to the destruction of the town by the Treres—and there seems to be little doubt of it, if only because a prior destruction in the first years of the seventh century is, to say the least, very uncertain—it follows that *somewhere between 652 and 645 the poet's dwelling-place was Thasos*;<sup>3</sup> and as he was not an old man when he emigrated to Thasos—the Kritias passage is ample and incontrovertible proof for it—the 'Woes of Magnesia', in spite of the shortness of the quite incidental allusion, clear up the whole problem of the Archilochean chronology in a most desirable manner: *the poet was a young man about 652 B.C.*

We ought to be glad to have besides the mention of Gyges (which, though fundamental, is chronologically vague) this date for the time of Archilochos' residence in Thasos, which is, in my opinion, if not decisive, at least something more than probable. For there remains the one really or seemingly serious argument of Blakeway's—'the Lelantine War fragment' (F 3), as he calls it. This he couples in the superscription with the Aithiops story, to show that in his opinion both poems refer to about the same time or at least the same generation; and that they are, together with the eclipse poem and the colonization poem (reconstructed from Oinomaos and Clement), the oldest datable compositions of Archilochos. They all belong to the eighth century and are followed closely by the Magnesia poem of 700/690 and, after a somewhat longer interval, by the Gyges poem, which was written after 687. In fact, there is in the synchronistic table at the end of Blakeway's paper<sup>4</sup> not much, if anything, left over from the poet's whole work for the period from about 680 to 640 B.C., which, I believe, was the time he lived and wrote. I have deliberately added the 'seemingly' to serious. For the very coupling of the two rather different poems, the Lelantine war one and the Aithiops one, might indicate a way out of the whole problem and free us possibly from the inconvenient task of entering into an historical discussion of the Lelantine

<sup>1</sup> There is no *terminus ante*; for the ἐξῆς ἐρος in the corrupt text of Strabo 14. 1. 40 is of no use. When in 545 Mazares, the general of Kyros, subjected Ionia to the Persian sway, Magnesia was one of the cities captured by him (Herodotus i. 161).

<sup>2</sup> Blakeway, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> This result does not even make it probable that he was still in Thasos at the time of the eclipse of 648 B.C. (see p. 108, n. 3).

<sup>4</sup> P. 53 f. The Gyges poem is not dated in the table. In Blakeway's opinion it should be the

last or one of the last efforts of Archilochos; and the death of the poet, which he dates (though his reasons are not clear to me) 'before 670/60 B.C.', should follow almost immediately. That would at least give a more probable age—say between 45 and 55, and one might as well choose the lesser number—than the 'not more than 65' (which it is rather generous not to deem 'old'), for the man who (as Blakeway and many others believe) was slain in a battle. And it would not damage Blakeway's line of argument at all; rather the contrary.

war at all. We have already stated that the Aithiops poem is really valueless as a proof that Archilochos lived in the eighth century, 'close in time to the event he narrates'. In the same manner, the Lelantine poem might furnish us only with a new *terminus post*—if it is a Lelantine war poem at all. For (to tell the plain truth) this designation in fact begs the question. There is no mention of the Lelantine war in Archilochos,<sup>1</sup> there is only a mention possibly of Euboea and certainly of the chivalrous fighting customs of the *δεσπότες Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί*, who, I should imagine, fought on horseback<sup>2</sup> as the Magnesians and Colophonians did at the same time and even later. The context of the fragment and the purport of the poem it is taken from, Plutarch does not indicate. It might be taken as a simple *παράδειγμα*, a known example of chivalrous fighting; but the future tense has always suggested that in comparing the perfidious weapons of the barbarians in Thrace with the knightly swords and lances of the Euboean *ἱπποβόται*, Archilochos either announced his own resolve to seek a new field for his activity, or counselled a friend, who is disgusted with the conditions of Thasian and Thracian life, to leave for Euboea either alone or in company with the poet.<sup>3</sup> But even if we take the verses as such a resolve or such an advice, they do not say that a war is on the point of breaking out,<sup>4</sup> but only that there is war in Euboea, and what manner of fighting a participant in it has to expect; and they, surely, give no support for a decision whether the war is 'the' Lelantine war (or a phase of it) or another feud.

As we have no historical results in view here, we shall have to rest satisfied with an alternative: if the Lelantine war is to be dated about 700 B.C., as by Blakeway<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As Blakeway has it, p. 47 (cf. p. 53): 'to endeavour to extract chronological data for Archilochos from the "Lelantine War" may seem to some historians like an attempt to illuminate twilight by complete darkness. For them the only certain chronological datum for that war is the mention of it by Archilochos' (the italics are mine). Like many others he is under the influence of an age-long discussion (this influence makes itself very curiously felt, e.g. in Crusius' article, *RE* ii. 495), and he does not quite seem to realize that he is on the whole merely returning to an opinion prevalent about 50-100 years ago. On the other hand, the reference of F 3 to the Lelantine war seems to receive an appreciable corroboration by Dr. Bowra's most attractive interpretation of F 56 (*Class. Rev.* liv, 1940, 127. When almost forty years ago I gave my first lecture on Greek elegy, I called this poem 'a prophecy of coming war', but did not put Bowra's pertinent question, where that war may have been): *Γλαῦχ' ὄρα· βαθὺς γὰρ ἦδη κύμασιν τάρσασται | πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄκρα Γυρέων* (Xylander *γύρεον, γύριον* MSS.) *ὄρθον ἴσταται νέφος, | σῆμα χιμῶνος· κινάνει δ' ἐξ ἀελπίτης φόβος*. There remains, it is true, a slight doubt, which I shall not develop here. But even granted Dr. Bowra's explanation (and I for one rather like it) the same objection holds good as against F 3: is it 'the' Lelantine war Archilochos means by the cloud arising from Euboea? I do not think we have a right to credit Archilochos with the political foresight to see that this war would be

an almost panhellenic war. Any feud would do for him.

<sup>2</sup> See Busolt, *Gr. G.* i. 457; Ed. Meyer, *GdA* ii. 231A. The help of Thessalian horsemen: Beloch, *Gr. G.* i. 1. 339.

<sup>3</sup> One should not forget that there is an alternative. Kritias (p. 103, n. 3) does not help, as he only says that in Thasos too the poet *τοῖς ἐνταῦθα ἐχθρὸς ἐγένετο*, and does not state for what destination he eventually left the island. I believe that he returned to Paros, and there and then had his affair with Neobule. The eclipse poem would have been written in Paros; but it is not quite certain that he saw the eclipse there. That Archilochos died in Euboea is, to be sure, not impossible, but it is mere guesswork: the man who slew him was a Naxian (that at least the evidence is agreed upon), and the Demeas chronicle knows of feuds between Paros and Naxos.

<sup>4</sup> As is the case with F 56, if we take it with Dr. Bowra as allegorical.

<sup>5</sup> P. 53 with the alternative that 'it was in progress or about to take place'. From the data collected p. 47 f. one would expect that the war filled about the last third of the eighth century; but Blakeway has to reckon with his 'conjectural date' of Archilochos' birth, which is 740/30. The opinion of the historians as to the date of the war is as divergent as can be, and Cary, *CAH* iii, 1925, 622 (who is himself content with a vague 'in the 8th or 7th century'), declares 'a more precise dating, such as modern scholars

and others, Archilochos cannot have fought in it, and if in F 3 he refers to this war (which there is no need to assume), he can have done so only by taking his knowledge of the fighting conditions in Euboia from this famous war. If, on the other hand, F 3 announces the poet's resolve to leave Thasos for Euboia and fight as a soldier (*καὶ δὴ πίκουρος ὥστε Κᾶρ κεκλήσομαι* F 40) for one of the conflicting parties in the 'Lelantine' war (which it seems even less necessary to conclude from the wording), the war must be brought down to the middle of the seventh century or even a little later to the decade 650/40. I am loath to do so, because our evidence for the great war, as far as it goes, points rather to the first third of the seventh or even to the last of the eighth century; and I am much more inclined to reject the old suggestion and to detach the poem from the Lelantine war. If the poet fought in Euboia at all, he did not fight in the great war, but in another feud. There will have been many of them.

To condense and put my opinion about Archilochos clearly, if somewhat tentatively, I believe we may be fairly sure that the poet lived almost half a century later than Hesiod; that he was younger than Terpander and approximately contemporary with (if perhaps a little younger than) Kallinos—say between 680 and 640 B.C. The Gyges poem retains its value as the fundamental evidence, being in all probability not composed in the beginning of the king's reign; the possibility that it was composed after the king's death cannot be wholly excluded. The allusion to the 'Woes of Magnesia' seems almost to prove, or to make it at least extremely probable, that about 652/0 the poet lived in Thasos. The eclipse poem shows that he had returned to Paros and had had his affair with the daughter of Lykambes either in the eclipse year 648 itself or not so very much later. What he did after that I do not know, nor can I give any further certain or conjectural date for an event in his life or for another of his poems. But when somewhat later he was slain in battle, probably in a feud between Paros and Naxos, there is no reason at all to believe him to have attained old age. From the character of his work one rather presumes that he died comparatively young—a meteor-like phenomenon in the sky of Greek poetry, midway between Hesiod and the Lesbians Alkaïos and Sappho.

F. JACOBY.

#### OXFORD.

attempted on the basis of some very uncertain literary allusions' to be 'hardly possible with the means at our disposal'. Ed. Meyer, *GdA* ii, 1893, § 342, puts 'the culminating point' of the war in the middle of the seventh century, Beloch, *Gr. G.* i. 1 (1912) 338 f. at about 670. The most cautious view is developed by Busolt, *Gr. G.* i<sup>2</sup>, 1893, 456; but his result that 'the main struggle was probably at the end of the 8th and in the first half of the 7th century' is not very

helpful. I am personally inclined to agree with Blakeway. But Thukyd. i. 13. 3 is not really decisive (what about 13. 4? And 15. 3 seems to imply that there were already several fleets in existence at the time of the war); and I cannot dismiss either Herodotos (6. 127. 4) as lightly as Ed. Meyer does or Theognis 891/4. But the whole question is really of no importance for Archilochos: we cannot date him from the war nor the war from him.

## SOME TEXTUAL NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S MORALIA

Πλουτάρχου σοφοῦ μεληδέα δέρκεο βιβλίον  
ἥθεα κοσμοῦσαν νόον δξύνουσιν ἄεργον.

So run two lines on the title-page of Marcianus 250 (X: xi+xiv cent.). Whether the *Moralia* still benefit the character or no, they may still serve to sharpen the wits; for in spite of the work of Meziriac, Reiske, and Wytttenbach, Madvig, Bernardakis, and Wilamowitz, to mention only some of those who have brought learning and sagacity to the task of emendation, there are still hundreds of passages which cry halt to the reader and challenge him to divine what Plutarch wrote.

Some of the following suggestions are built on an uncertain foundation, since no completed edition of the *Moralia* has an *apparatus criticus* of any value for criticism. However, in the new Teubner edition there have appeared four volumes which carry us down to 775 E and provide an apparatus which, though it may have imperfections, gives a serviceable basis for conjecture. As much may be said of the treatises *de facie*, *de communibus notitiis*, *adversus Colotem*, *de Herodoti malignitate*, *de animae procreatione*, which, together with three other works already included in the new Teubner edition, namely, *Amatorius*, *de Pythiae oraculis*, *de Socratis daemónio*, are preserved only in Parisini 1672 (E: early xiv cent.) and 1675 (B: xv cent.). Collations of these eight treatises, marred by some errors according to W. Sieveking (ed. Teubner, vol. iii, Praef. xxviii), were published by M. Treu, *Zur Geschichte der Überlieferung von Plutarchs Moralia II* (1884).

A small addition may be made to the history of these eight treatises. It is well known that Maximus Planudes had not yet come across them when he first made his collection of the *Moralia*, but found them in time for inclusion in his magnificent complete Plutarch, *Lives and Moralia*, the manuscript E. Apparently they all came from the same source, for they all exhibit frequent lacunae, explicable by the illegibility either of the manuscript in which they were found, or more probably of one of its ancestors. It has not, however, been noticed that that or a similar manuscript was known to the writer of the title-page of X. After giving a list of the contents of the eleventh-century portion of that manuscript, namely twenty-nine out of the seventy-eight works which make up the Planudean collection of the *Moralia*, he adds *ἔως ὧδε ὁ πίναξ τῶν λόγων τοῦ παρόντος βιβλίου, λείπονσι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἠθικῶν ἑτεροὶ δέκα λόγοι ὧν αἱ ἐπιγραφαὶ εἰσιν αἰδε*. He then gives five titles: *Amatorius*, *de facie*, *de animae procreatione*, *quaestiones Platonicae*, *de Pythiae oraculis*<sup>1</sup>—and there he stops. Four of these titles belong to our group of eight; *quaestiones Platonicae* does not. But there was already reason to believe that the manuscript found by Planudes contained that work; for whereas in the Planudean manuscripts earlier than E and in all their descendants its beginning is missing, and marked as such by blank pages and the words *Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα ὧν οὐχ εὐρέθη ἡ ἀρχή*, in E those words have been deleted and the blank pages filled up by the original writer; hence Treu (op. cit. I, p. xi) guessed that the beginning of *quaestiones Platonicae* was found in the newly discovered manuscript. Next we may observe that in E and B the first three of the group of eight additional treatises are *Amatorius*, *de facie*, and *de Pythiae oraculis*. Our list in X has the same order, with the intrusion of *quaestiones Platonicae*, for which we can now account, and *de animae procreatione*, the work which comes last of the group in EB. But the place of this latter treatise in our list creates no difficulty: it would not be surprising if Planudes did not immediately recognize that in it he had

<sup>1</sup> For convenience I give the titles in their familiar Latin dress.



something new, but at first passed it over, for he had already included in his Corpus a long extract, absurdly titled an *Epitome*, which he had got from some other source. It is noteworthy that the complete text is added to E in a hand which is not that which wrote the rest of the group. I would suggest, therefore, that when the writer of X's title-page wrote *λείπονσι* . . . *δέκα λόγοι*, he knew of some manuscript which contained, besides the five he mentions, *adversus Colotem, de communibus notitiis, de Socratis daemonio, de Herodoti malignitate*, in that order, the order of EB, together with at least one more work from those *Moralia* which are found elsewhere.

In these notes I have followed the new Teubner edition in using  $\Omega$  to mean all collated manuscripts, O to mean all besides those specifically mentioned. Where no collations are available, I use no sign; the reading is that which editors state or imply that they have found somewhere. \* denotes my own suggestions.

*de fortuna.*

98 F:  $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$   $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\circ\iota\varsigma$   $\alpha\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\circ\iota$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$   $\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ,  $\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\mu\acute{\eta}\mu\eta$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\eta$   $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\text{'}\text{Αναξαγόραν διαφέροντες αὐτῶν χρώμεθα καὶ βλίστομεν καὶ ἀμέλγομεν καὶ φέρομεν καὶ ἄγομεν συλλαμβάνοντες.$

διαφέροντες \*:  $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\tau\epsilon$  O  $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\tau\iota$  Y<sup>1</sup> M<sup>1</sup>INh<sup>1</sup>Δn  $\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$   $\tau\epsilon$  Bernardakis  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega$   $\tau\epsilon$  Sauppe  $\phi\omega\eta\eta$   $\tau\epsilon$  Pearson  $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}\iota$   $\tau\epsilon$  Naber 'dativus latet' Pohlenz.

ΔΙΑ could be lost after AN, and CΦΩ is not altogether unlike ΦΕΡΟ. Just before, several MSS. have  $\delta\alpha\lambda\lambda'$   $\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\circ\iota\varsigma$  for  $\alpha\eta\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\circ\iota\varsigma$ , a parallel for the misreading of a familiar word in majuscule writing; compare also the note on 1085 c.  $\chi\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ , sc.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\circ\iota\varsigma$ , which cannot be expressed after  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ : horses, dogs, &c., would be in Plutarch's mind.

*de invidia et odio.*

537 E:  $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$   $\tau\circ\iota\nu\nu$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\tau\circ\iota\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\circ\iota\varsigma$   $\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\phi\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\langle$   $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$   $\delta'$   $\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{o}\xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\rangle$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu$   $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\circ\iota\varsigma$   $\mu\iota\sigma\sigma\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\gamma\epsilon$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu$   $\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$   $\epsilon\pi\iota\delta\iota\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ,  $\phi\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu$   $\tau\circ\iota\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu$   $\epsilon\pi'$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\eta$   $\pi\rho\circ\iota\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$   $\delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ .

$\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$  \*:  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$   $\Omega$ .

$\langle$   $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  (sc.  $\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ) . . .  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{o}\xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\rangle$  \*:  $\langle$   $\delta\theta\epsilon\nu$   $\rangle$  Pohlenz.

$\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  Wyttenbach:  $\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\Omega$   $\langle$   $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$   $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\rangle$   $\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  Kronenberg.

$\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\circ\iota\varsigma$   $\Omega$ :  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\circ\iota\varsigma$  Wilamowitz  $\alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\varsigma$  Pohlenz.

$\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu^2$  and  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu^4$  om. Lcy.

Kronenberg interprets his suggestion as follows: 'natura comparatum est ut invicem non succedant, i.e. ut odium invidiae non inolescat neque invidia odio'; but this seems contrary to everyday experience. Pohlenz translates his emendation thus: 'necessario hi affectus ut plantae isdem rebus quibus nascuntur etiam crescunt: unde secundum eandem rationem etiam intenduntur.' Apart from the forced translation of  $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  by *nasci*, the sense of this is not altogether satisfactory.

The treatise opens with the statement that at first sight hate and envy would seem to be identical. There follow seven arguments to prove that they are distinct, and the passage here emended introduces the sixth. The context therefore seems to demand a sense such as I have endeavoured to give, namely: 'Passions that are the same (as one another) must necessarily, like plants (of the same species), be nourished and increased by the same things: but these passions (envy and hate) are naturally aggravated and made more intense in the opposite manner to one another.'

*de sera numinis vindicta.*

567 A: <sup>1</sup>  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\gamma\eta\nu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\varsigma$   $\pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omega\nu$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\theta\iota$   $\tau\eta\eta$

<sup>1</sup> I have already published this in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 1931, p. 7.

κακίαν οὐκέτι λίαν χαλεπῶς οὐδ' ὁμοίως τριβομένην, ἄτε δὴ περὶ τὸ ἄλογον καὶ παθητικὸν ἐπιπόλαιον οὖσαν . . . ἐνίους δ' ἀναδέρνοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ἀναπτύσσοντας ἀπεδείκνυσαν ὑπούλους καὶ ποικίλους, ἐν τῷ λογιστικῷ καὶ κύριῳ τὴν μοχθηρίαν ἔχοντας.

γνωρίμους Reiske: γνωρίμων Ω.

κακίαν \*: σκιάν Ω αἰκίαν Pohlenz.

οὐκέτι λίαν Madvig: οὐκέτ' εἶναι Ω.

ἄτε δὴ C. F. Hermann (and IR): ἄτελες O.

ἐπιπόλαιον \*: ἐπίπονον Ω ἔτι μόνον Pohlenz.

σκιάν is impossible because the soul in the next world is never called σκιά by Plutarch, or, I imagine, by anyone who believes in the survival of full personality after death.

*de fato* (pseudo-Plutarch).

569 C: . . . ἐπειδὴν ἡ αὕτη ἀφίκεται αἰτία, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως οἱ αὐτοὶ γενόμενοι πράξομεν, οὕτω δὲ καὶ πάντες ἄνθρωποι· καὶ τὰ θ' ἐξῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐξῆς αἰτίαν γενήσεται καὶ πραχθήσεται, καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα κατὰ μίαν τῶν ὧν περίοδον, καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην τῶν ὧν ὡσαύτως ἀποδοθήσεται.

μίαν τῶν ὧν \*: μίαν τὴν ὧν Ω. The second τῶν ὧν might be a misplaced correction, and therefore to be deleted.

570 C: οὐ πάντα ῥητέον καθ' εἰμαρμένην οὐδ' εἰ κὰν εἰμαρμένη πάντα.

κὰν εἰμαρμένη \*: καθ' εἰμαρμένη Ω.

Omitted words and phrases, sometimes marked by blank spaces, are a common feature of the text of *de fato*. The following passage can have sense given to it by free conjectural supplement.

572 D: καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς τύχης ταυθ' ἱκανά· <ἐξῆς δὲ σκεπτέον> οἷς συνυφίστασθαι <αὐτὴν> ἀνάγκη. τὸ μὲν <ἐνδεχόμενον τῶν κατὰ προαίρεσιν> [ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παρωνύμους] καὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν προῦποκεισθαι ἐλέγχθαι (571 D-E), τὸ δ' αὐτόματον ἐπὶ πλείον τῆς τύχης <ἐστίν>· εἰ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴν περιλαβὼν ἔχει καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἄλλοτ' ἄλλως συμπίπτει πεφυκότων· ἔστι δὲ κατ' ὄνομα, ὅπερ <ἀπὸ τοῦ> αὐτὸ μάτην <παρωνύμους> λέγεται, τὸ πεφυκὸς ἄλλου ἔνεκα ὅταν μὴ ἐκεῖνο περ(αῖνη οὐ ἔνεκα) ἐπεφύκει.

<ἐξῆς δὲ σκεπτέον> Sieveking: lac. xii litt. Xa.

οἷς . . . <αὐτὴν> Wytttenbach: ὡς Ω.

<ἐνδεχόμενον τῶν κατὰ προαίρεσιν> [ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παρωνύμους] \*: <οὖν ἐνδεχόμενον>

[ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παρωνύμους καὶ] Sieveking.

<ἐστίν> \*, comparing Aristotle, *Physics*, 197<sup>a</sup> 36: διαφέρει δ' ὅτι τὸ αὐτόματον ἐπὶ πλείον ἐστι, τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τύχης πᾶν ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου, τοῦτο δ' οὐ πᾶν ἀπὸ τύχης.

<ἀπὸ τοῦ> αὐτὸ μάτην <παρωνύμους> \*: αὐτόματον Ω. The omitted words were wrongly replaced above, where in fact ἐνδεχόμενον κτλ. had fallen out; ἀπὸ τοῦ may have been corrupted before it fell out. This is a more complicated example of a type of error which is not uncommon in a simple form.<sup>1</sup> The sentence is based on Aristotle, *Physics*, 197<sup>b</sup> 25: ὡς τοῦτο ὄν τὸ μάτην, τὸ πεφυκὸς ἄλλου ἔνεκα, ὅταν μὴ περαῖνη ἐκεῖνο οὐ ἔνεκα ἦν καὶ ἐπεφύκει (ἦν καὶ om. EV) . . . οὕτω δὴ τὸ αὐτόματον καὶ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα ὅταν αὐτὸ μάτην γένηται.

περ(αῖνη οὐ ἔνεκα) Wytttenbach (but with ἦν καὶ after ἔνεκα): παρ lac. xi litt. X ix litt. a. But for Aristotle one might supply παρ(έχῃ . . .); compare also

1051 C: περαινομένων O παραινομένων ν παραινομένων X<sup>1</sup> παραγομένων X<sup>3</sup>g παραγομένην B.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. 1045 F καὶ (τὸ) ὡς ἔτυχεν ἐπικλῖνον τῆς διανοίας [τὸ] ἀνευ πάσης αἰτίας. At 1039 D Meziriac made the necessary addition of οὖν after πολ-

λαχοῦ μὲν; the corrector X<sup>3</sup> had already tried to do this but had placed the οὖν after the μὲν of the previous sentence, where it is senseless.

*Amatorius.*

758 E: *έτέρα δ' έστιν* (sc. *μανία*) *οὐκ αθείαστος οὐδ' οίκογενής, ἀλλ' έπηλυς έπίπνοια καὶ παρατροπή τοῦ λογιζομένου καὶ φρονούντος, <έκ> [ἀρχήν] κρείττονος δυνάμειος ἀρχήν έχουσα καὶ κίνησις. . .*

*έκ addidi ἀρχήν eiecti: κατοχήν Meziriac ἀρωγήν Apelt.*

K. Hubert, following Winckelmann, defends the MS. reading, quoting 1125 C: *πῶς τις έκών είναι μὴ πρόσεισιν έξ ἀρχῆς έπὶ τὰς τῶν πληθῶν ἀρχάς.* But these words are a quotation from Epicurus, not Plutarch's own; and the lack of emphasis on *έξ ἀρχῆς* makes the careless repetition of the word *ἀρχή* tolerable. I suppose that a copyist, having anticipated the word *ἀρχήν*, attempted to return to the right place, but being confused by the succession of letters OCEKK, missed out *έκ*.

*maxime cum principibus uiris philosopho esse disserendum.*

776 B (the opening words of the treatise). <Ἀνδρὸς ήγεμονικοῦ συνήθειαν> ὦ Ἡρκλανε, έγκολπίσασθαι καὶ φιλίαν τιμῶν καὶ μετιέναι καὶ προσδέχεσθαι καὶ γεωργεῖν, πολλοῖς μὲν ἰδία πολλοῖς δέ καὶ δημοσία χρήσιμον καὶ έγκαρπον γενησομένην, φιλοκάλων έστὶ καὶ πολιτικῶν καὶ φιλανθρωπῶν οὐχ ὡς ένοι νομίζουσι φιλοδόξων.

<Ἀνδρὸς . . . συνήθειαν> ὦ Ἡρκλανε \* *exempli causa: Σωκρατόν.*

A proper name in the accusative is impossible, as the treatise clearly discusses not an individual case but the general proposition that philosophers should consort with potentates. But *Σωκρατόν* may conceal a vocative, and a rubricator may have failed to do his job. For *Herculanus* see 539 A; another possibility is *Soclarus*, whether we should understand Plutarch's friend or son; or, again, some unknown *Soranus* or *Servianus* might be the addressee.

*an seni respublica gerenda sit.*

796 A: see 1045 D.

*de unius in republica dominatione.*

826 F-827 A

In C.Q. xxxiii I proposed a series of alterations dependent on changing *βασιλεία* μὲν ὕβριν έντέκη άνυπεύθυνον το βασιλεία μὲν ὕβριν έντέκη τάνυπεύθυνον. It may be added in support of this that the Stoics defined *βασιλεία* as *ἀρχή άνυπεύθυνος* (S.V.F. iii. 617, cf. [Plato] *Def.* 415 B, *βασιλεὺς ἀρχων κατὰ νόμους άνυπεύθυνος*).

*Aristophanis et Menandri comparatio.*

853 D: καὶ τοσαύτας διαφορὰς έχουσα καὶ άνομοιότητας ή λέξις οὐδὲ τὸ πρέπον έκάστω καὶ οίκεϊον άποδίδωσιν, οἷον λέγειν βασιλεῖ τὸν ὄγκον ρήτορι τήν δεινότητα κτλ.

*έκάστω \* : έκάστη.*

854 D: οὐδενὶ γάρ ὁ άνθρωπος έοικε μετρίῳ τήν ποίησιν γεγραφέναι, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν αἰσχροὶ καὶ άσελγή τοῖς άμαθεστέροις τὰ βλάσφημα δέ καὶ πικρὰ τοῖς βασκάνοις καὶ κακοήθεσιν.

*άμαθεστέροις \* : αληθεστέροις. ακολάστοις edd.*

The contrast between *μέτριος* and *άμαθέστερος* is not difficult, for *μέτριος*, in Plutarch as elsewhere, often means little more than 'good'. Compare Wyttenbach's Index and Plato, *Rep.* 423 E *εάν εἰ παιδευόμενοι μέτριοι άνδρες γίνωνται.*

*de sollertia animalium.*

964 C: οὐδὲ γάρ αὐτοὶ τῷ Ἐπικούρῳ διδόασιν ὑπὲρ τῶν μεγίστων σμικρὸν οὕτω πρᾶγμα καὶ φαῖλον, οἶμαι, άπομον παρεγκλίνει μίαν έπὶ τοῦλάχιστον, ὅπως άστρο καὶ ζῶα τύχη παρεσέλθη καὶ τὸ έφ' ήμῖν μὴ άπόληται· δεικνύναι δέ τὸ ἄδηλον ή λαμβάνειν τι τῶν προδήλων

<κελεύουσι πῶς> καὶ προσήκει τὸ περὶ τῶν ζώων ὑποτίθεσθαι πρὸς τὴν δικαιοσύνην, εἰ μήθ' ὁμολογεῖται μήτ' ἄλλως δεικνύουσιν;

τύχη or κατὰ τύχην \*: καὶ τύχη. καὶ ψυχὴ Madvig. Gassendi thought the corruption went further and wrote ὅπως εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἢ τύχη.

<κελεύουσι (dative) πῶς> \*

'Nor do they themselves concede to Epicurus, to make possible most essential points of his doctrine, a thing so small and unimportant, one would think, as that one single atom should make the smallest possible deviation from its course; the object being that stars and animals should come into existence by chance and that free-will should not be lost. But seeing that they bid him demonstrate what is not obvious or take as his starting-point something that is obvious, they are in no position to make this statement about animals (i.e. that they are irrational) a basis of their account of justice, when it is neither generally accepted nor otherwise demonstrated by them.'

It is well known that the Epicurean doctrine of the swerving atom was designed to allow of two things: first, that there should be a beginning of the atomic collisions and resulting combined movements which form the things of the universe; second, that the state of the world at one moment should not determine its state at the next; for that would have involved the denial of free will. But why, when the whole universe and all that is in it is dependent on the swerve, does Plutarch here mention stars and animals alone? Is it not because stars and animals are treated by the deist as the best arguments for the existence of divinity? The Epicurean has in particular to show that they 'slip into existence by chance', he must explain

sidera solem  
lunaeque globum, tum quae tellure animantes  
extiterint (Lucretius v. 68-70).

One may compare Lactantius *Inst. Div.* iii. 17. 16 (*Epicurea* 370):

Si enim providentia nulla est, quomodo tam ordinate, tam disposite mundus effectus est? . . . quomodo animalium corpora tam providenter ordinata sunt? . . . non est, inquit, providentiae opus; sunt enim semina per inane volitantia, quibus inter se temere conglobatis universa gignuntur.

*de esu carniū.*

993 B: καὶ νεκρῶν σωμάτων καὶ ἐώλων προθέμενος τραπέζας ὄψα καὶ τροφὰς καὶ \* \* προσεῖπεν τὰ μικρὰ ἐμπροσθεν βρυχώμενα μέρη καὶ φθεγγόμενα καὶ κοινούμενα καὶ βλέποντα.

τροφὰς or τροφήν [Aldine]: τρυφὰς or τρυφήν [Stephanus]. Cf. τροφή καὶ ὄψον 98 E, and the same confusion of τροφή and τρυφή at 159C, 477D, and 551D. It is not the meat-eater but the vegetarian who calls meat τρυφὰς.

προσεῖπεν Kronenberg: προσέτι εἰπεῖν. Kronenberg wishes to delete καὶ, but two adjectives may have been succeeded by three nouns and four participles. The simplest supplement would be σιτία.

993 C: τοῖς μὲν πρώτοις ἐκείνοις ἐπιχειρήσας σαρκοφαγεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν [ἀν] εἴποι πᾶς ἀν <τὴν χρεῖαν> καὶ τὴν ἀπορίαν.

[ἀν] εἴποι πᾶς ἀν <τὴν χρεῖαν> καὶ \*: ἀν εἴποι πᾶσαν καὶ. ἀν εἴποι τις πᾶσαν εἶναι Bernardakis. Amyot saw that a noun was missing, and translated 'pour leur disette et nécessité'.

*de Stoicorum repugnantibus.*<sup>1</sup>

1045 D: A quotation from Chrysippus, who considered the duty of a judge faced with a dead heat. πότερον, φησὶν, ἐξεστὶ τὸν βραβευτὴν τὸν φοῖνικα ὁποτέρῳ βούλεται ἀποδοῦναι, καθ' ὃ ἀν τύχῳσιν αὐτῷ συνηθέστεροι ὄντες, ὥς ἀν ἐνταῦθα τῶν αὐτοῦ τι χαρισάμενον, <ῆ> τρόπον τινα μᾶλλον, ὥς κοινοῦ τοῦ φοῖνικος γεγονότος ἀμφοτέρων, οἷον εἰ τῶς

<sup>1</sup> I have my own collations of XFα (in part) BγE Vat. reg. 80 Bgavz.



κλήρου γενομένου <κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ κλισίῳ> [ἐν ἄλλῳ κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ κλισίῳ] ὡς ἔτυχε δοῦναι αὐτόν;  
καθ' ὃ ἂν von Arnim: κᾶν Ω.

χαρισάμενον O: χαρισόμενον FX<sup>4</sup> χαριούμενον B.

<ῆ> post μάλλον addidit Wytttenbach, post τινὰ von Arnim; <ῆ καθήκει> post  
χαρισάμενον Pohlenz.

γενομένου Bernardakis: γενομένου Ω.

ἐν ἄλλῳ g: ἐνάλλως Vat. Reg. 80 ἐνάλλως O ἀδήλως Pohlenz.

ἐπὶ κλισίῳ gF<sup>1</sup>γ<sup>1</sup>B: ἐπὶ κλισίῳ F<sup>2</sup>γ<sup>2</sup>βEX<sup>4</sup> edd.

It is doubtful where ῆ is best inserted; we may notice τρόπον τινὰ at the beginning of the clause in another quotation from Chrysippus, 1042 B.

A marginal variant has ousted the true reading, restored by later MSS. and later hands, who did not, however, eject ἐν ἄλλῳ (sc. βιβλίῳ) which had become ἐνάλλως. g is a badly interpolated MS., but often agrees with the excellent X, the original version of which is here missing, and the corrector X<sup>3</sup>, who had access to readings differing from those of the archetype. (Some of these readings are also found in B, which is fundamentally, however, a MS. of the Planudean recension.) On the evidence available to me g appears to give a text derived from X after that MS. had been corrected by X<sup>3</sup>, but heavily overlaid by conjecture and error. Pohlenz, who has the advantage of having collations for other treatises besides *de Stoicorum repugnantiis*, prefers to believe in an independent descent. I think that a similar error may be detected at 796 A: δεῖ πορρωτάτω τοῦ φθονεῖν ὄντα τὸν πολιτικὸν γέροντα μὴ καθάπερ τὰ βάσκανα γεράνδρα τῶν παραβλαστανόντων καὶ ὑποφνομένων σαφῶς ἀφαιρεῖσθαι καὶ κολοῦναι τὴν βλάστην καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν. Here σαφῶς makes no sense.<sup>1</sup> I suspect that once some slight corruption of ὑποφνομένων, e.g. ἀποφνομένων, stood in the text, and an intelligent reader wrote in his margin ὑποφνομένων σαφῶς.<sup>2</sup> If this is right, he was more confident than the original composer of the note that appears in the margin of X (in the first hand) at 1053 D: εἰ δὲ φήσει τις ἴσως οἶμαι. The text of X has εἰ δὲ φήσει τις, and φήσει is obviously correct.

1046 F: οὐκ αἰ φησιν ἀνδρίζεσθαι τὸν ἀστεῖον οὐδὲ δειλαίνειν τὸν φαῦλον, ὡς δεῶν ἐν φαντασίαις ἐπιφερομένων τινῶν τὸν μὲν ἐμμένειν τοῖς κρίμασι τὸν δ' ἀφίστασθαι.

δεῶν ἐν \*: δέον ἐν Ω δὲ ἐν edd. δὲ <τοιοῦτον ὄντα γεγόμενον> et postea δεινῶν  
pro τινῶν Pohlenz.

Cf. δέη ἐπιπέμπει Lysias 6. 20 and δέα ἐπαγόντων Aelian, H.A. 8. 10. τὸν μὲν sc. φαῦλον. For the construction with infinitive of oratio obliqua in the ὡς clause cf. Thucydides 5. 46. 3.

de communibus notitiis.

1061 C: ἄλλῳ γὰρ οὐδενὶ τοῦ φιλοπόνου τὸν κενόσπουδον ἀφορίζομεν ἐν τοῖς <αὐτοῖς> ἔργοις ὄντα πολλάκις ἢ τῷ τὸν μὲν εἰς ἀνωφελῆ πονεῖν καὶ ἀδιαφόρως τὸν δ' ἐνεκά του τῶν συμφερόντων καὶ λυσιτελῶν.

<αὐτοῖς> \*

1063 D: ὁ δὲ φαῦλος καὶ ἀνόητος οἷος εἰπεῖν

γέμω κακῶν δὴ καὶ οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπου τεθῇ.

γέμω \*: γέμων Ω καὶ οὐκ Ω: κούκέτ' edd.

The MSS. again give καὶ οὐκ at 1048 F where this quotation recurs. Similarly at 827 c the following line is ascribed to Aeschylus: σύ τοί με φύσῃς σύ με καταθῆναι δοκεῖς; the line is given in the same form in the *Life of Demetrius*, c. 35, except that there two of the four MSS. used by Lindskog and Ziegler, together with a corrector in a third, mend the metre by inserting μοι before δοκεῖς. It seems possible that Plutarch

<sup>1</sup> 'fere abundans', Wytttenbach, *Index*, s.v.

<sup>2</sup> For σαφῶς cf. Schol. *Iliad*, 8. 149.

knew these lines of Euripides and Aeschylus only in a corrupt form. In the same way it is doubtful whether any alteration should be made at 1056 c, where we find *δρῶμέν τε τοιάδ' ἃ σὺ τυγχάνεις φρονῶν*, supported as this is by the manuscript P of Euripides (*Suppl.* 736), which has *ἃ σὺ τυγχάνης*. (The Oxford text of Euripides falsely gives Reiske's conjecture *ἃ σύ γε*, taken from old texts of Euripides, as the reading of Plutarch.)

1069 A: *καὶ μὴν πάντες ἄνθρωποι τὰς ἐκλογὰς καὶ τὰς τηρήσεις καὶ τὰς οἰκονομίας, ὅταν χρησίμων ᾖσι καὶ ὠφελίμων, τότε χρησίμους καὶ ὠφελίμους ὑπολαμβάνουσιν.*

*χρησίμων ᾖσι καὶ ὠφελίμων \* : χρησιμοὶ ᾖσι καὶ ὠφέλιμοι Ω.*

1072 B: The distribution of speeches between Diadumenus and his interlocutor, dubbed Lamprias without warrant by the editors, has not hitherto been correctly made. Diadumenus' friend should end with the words *τὴν γὰρ ὑπέρου περιτροπὴν, ἵνα μὴ σκώπτειν δοκῆς, ἔασον*. To which Diadumenus replies *καίτοι τὸν γε λόγον αὐτῶν ὁμοιον ἐκείνῳ πάθος κατελήφε κτλ.*

1075 D: *ἔτι τοῖνυν ἐπαγωνιζόμενος ὁ Κλεάνθης τῇ ἐκπύρωσει λέγει τὴν σελήνην καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἄστρον τὸν ἥλιον <τότε συσπεύδοντ'> ἐξομοῖωσαι πάντα ἑαυτῷ καὶ μεταβαλεῖν εἰς ἑαυτὸν. ἀλλ' εἰ πάντες <οἱ ἄστέρες θεοὶ ὄντες πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν φθορὰν συνεργοῦσι [τῷ ἡλίῳ, συνεργοῦντές τι πρὸς τὴν ἐκπύρωσιν], πολλὸς ἂν εἴη γέλως ἡμᾶς περὶ σωτηρίας αὐτοῖς προσεύχεσθαι κτλ.*

After *ἥλιον* B has a lacuna of 8-9 letters, E one of 14-15. Bernardakis suggested *<ἐξάψαντ' ἂν>*, Pohlenz *<συνεκπυρῶμεν>* or *<αὐτὰ συνεργοῦντ'>*. In the next sentence I suggest *ἀλλ' εἰ πάντες*: B has *ἀλλ' ὅτι* and a lacuna of 4-5 letters, E *ἀλλ' ὅτι* and a lacuna of 3-4 letters. Von Arnim found *συνεργοῦντές τι* suspicious but did not recognize the gloss; BE have *συνεργοῦντός ἐστι*, corrected in the Basle edition. Madvig wished to read *ἐξομοῖωσειν*, but for a Stoic there had been innumerable conflagrations in the past, as there would be in the future.

1078 A: *ὣν ἐστὶ τὸ "τὰ τρία τέσσαρα εἶναι". τοῦτ' ἂν οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι λέγουσιν ἐν ὑπερβολῇ παράδειγμα τῶν ἀδιανοήτων· τοῖσι δὲ συμβαίνει τὸν ἕνα κύαθον τοῦ οἴνου πρὸς δύο κεραννόμενον ὕδατος, εἰ μέλλει μὴ ἀπολείπειν ἀλλ' ἐξισοῦσθαι, παράγοντας ἐπὶ πᾶν καὶ διασυγχέοντας ἐν' ὄντα δύο ποιεῖν [τῇ πρὸς τοὺς δύο κράσεως ἐξισώσει]· τὸ γὰρ μένειν ἕνα καὶ διεῖν παρεκτείνειν καὶ ποιεῖν ἴσον τῷ διπλασίῳ <τὸ ἡμισυ παράλογόν ἐστιν>· εἰ δ', ὅπως ἐξίκηται τῇ κράσει πρὸς τοὺς δύο, δεῦν λαμβάνει μέτρον ἐν τῇ διαχύσει, τὸ αὐτὸ μέτρον ἅμα καὶ τριῶν ἐστὶ καὶ τεσσάρων· τριῶν μὲν ὅτι τοῖς δύο εἰς μέμικται, τεσσάρων δ' ὅτι δυσὶ μεμιγμένους ἴσον ἔσχηκε πλῆθος οἷς μίγνυνται. τοῦτό <τε> δὴ συμβαίνει τὸ καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἐμβάλλουσιν σῶμα εἰς σώματα καὶ τὸ τῆς περιοχῆς ἀδιανόητον· ἀνάγκη γὰρ κτλ.*

*ἐπὶ πᾶν Wytttenbach: εἴ τι πᾶν Ω.*

[*τῇ πρὸς τοὺς δύο κράσεως ἐξισώσει*] \*, comparing the intrusive explanation in 1075 D.

*<τὸ ἡμισυ παράλογόν ἐστιν> \**

*λαμβάνει \*, Amyot: λαμβάνει Ω.*

*τὸ αὐτό \*: τοῦτο Ω <τε> \**

1084 E: *τούτοις δ' ἔποιτ' ἂν, εἰ περιψύξει τὰ θερμώτατα γεννώσι καὶ πυκνώσει τὰ κούφωτα, θερμότητι πάλιν αὐτὰ ψυχρὰ καὶ συγχύσει τὰ πυκνὰ καὶ διακρίσει τὰ βαρέα γεννᾶν, ἀλογίας τινὰ φυλάττουσιν ἀναλογίαν.*

*τινὰ \*: τινὸς Ω*

1085 C: *ὁ θεὸς δέ, εἴπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀσώματος οὐδ' αἷλος, ὡς ἀρχῆς μετέσχηκε τῆς ὕλης. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐν καὶ ταῦτόν ἡ ὕλη καὶ ὁ λόγος, οὐκ εὖ τὴν ὕλην ἀλογον ἀποδεδώκασι· εἰ δ' ἕτερα καὶ διαφέροντα, μὴ γὰρ ἂν τις ὁ θεὸς εἴη καὶ οὐχ ἀπλοῦν ἀλλὰ σύνθετον πρᾶγμα τῷ νοερῷ τὸ σωματικὸν ἐκ τῆς ὕλης προσειληφώς.*

*καὶ διαφέροντα, μὴ γὰρ \*: καὶ ἀμφοτέρων ταμίας E (καὶ ἀμφοτέρων ἂν τις ὁ θεὸς εἴη ταμίας B) [καὶ] ἀμφοτέρων <ταμείων, οὐ> ταμίας Pohlenz (καὶ iam seclusit Wytttenbach).*

*non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum.*

1102 B: αὐλὸν μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ὦν ἐορτῶν καὶ στέφανον ἀφαιροῦμεν, θεοῦ δὲ θυσία μὴ παρόντος, ὥσπερ Ἐπικούρου δόγμα θεῖόν ἐστι, καὶ ἀνεόρταστον καὶ ἀνενθουσίαστον τὸ λειπόμενον, μᾶλλον δὲ <τὸ> ὅλον ἀτερπὲς αὐτῷ καὶ λυπηρόν· ὑποκρίνεται γὰρ εὐχὰς κτλ.

ἔστιν ὦν Reiske: ἐτέρων. τινῶν Meziriac.

<ἐπ>ικούρου δόγμα θεῖόν ἐστι \*: ἱερὸν δοχῆς ἄθεόν ἐστι. ἱερῶν δοχέως (vel ἱεροδοχέως), ἄθεόν ἐστι Madvig ἱερὸν χολῆς, ἄθεόν ἐστι maluit Bernardakis.

<τὸ> ὅλον \*: ὅλον. ὅλως Wytttenbach.

To say that if god is not present at a sacrifice, the ceremony is godless, is to state the obvious, and to combine ἄθεον with ἀνεόρταστον and ἀνενθουσίαστον spoils the balance of the sentence, in which the two latter adjectives correspond to the pair ἀτερπὲς καὶ λυπηρόν. The corruption therefore extends to the word ἄθεον. Moreover, unless Epicurus is mentioned in this sentence, αὐτῷ must be very harshly referred to ἀνδρὶ ἀπεγνωκότῃ τῆς προνοίας in the previous sentence but one. It is possible that καὶ after ἐστι is an insertion to combine the corrupted word ἄθεον with the succeeding adjectives.

To the ordinary man a sacrifice without the god's presence was only a partial ceremony (τὸ λειπόμενον), but Epicurus did not believe that it could be anything more; for him it was complete (τὸ ὅλον).

1104 E: Having said that death is not feared because of any stories of Aeacus or Acheron, but because it threatens eternal unconsciousness, Plutarch continues:

καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀπόλωλε καὶ τὸ ἀνήρηται καὶ τὸ οὐκ ἔστι ταρασσονται, καὶ δυσανασχετοῦσι τούτων λεγομένων ὡς τὸ ἔπειτα

κείσεται βαθυδένδρῳ

ἐν χθονὶ συμποσίῳν τε καὶ λυρᾶν ἄμοιρος

ἰαχὰς τε παντερπέος αὐλῶν (frag. lyr. adesp. 96)

καὶ

ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἔλθῃν οὔτε λείσθη

οὔθ' ἔλετη ἔπει ἄρ κεν ἀμείψεται ἔρκος ὀδόντων.

<πότερον οὖν τὰ τοιαῦτα λύουσιν> ἢ καὶ προσεπισφίγγουσιν οἱ ταυτὶ λέγοντες· “ἅπαρ ἄνθρωποι γεγυῖναι, δις δ' οὐκ ἔστι γενέσθαι· δεῖ δὲ τὸν αἰῶνα μηκέτ' εἶναι”;

<πότερον . . . λύουσιν> ἢ καὶ προσεπισφίγγουσιν \*: ἢ καὶ προσεπισφάττουσιν. τί καὶ προσεπισφάττουσιν Reiske (προσεπισφάσκουσιν Apelt).

Compare Sextus, *adv. M.* 2. 96: τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν οἱ εἰς τοῦναντίον ἐπιχειροῦντες τὴν ἀμφισβήτησιν λύειν ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων αὐτὴν ἐπισφίγγειν, and Philo *quod deus sit immutabilis* 124: προσεπισφίγγων . . . ἐπιφέρει (i.e. ‘by way of driving the point home he adds the following phrase’).

1105 E: νοεῖν πάρεστιν ἡλίκης ἑαυτοῦς χαρᾶς ἀποστεροῦσι, φάσματα μὲν καὶ εἰδῶλα τεθνηκότων ἐταίρων οἴομενοι δέχεσθαι καὶ θεωρεῖν . . . αὐτοῖς δὲ συνέσεσθαι πάλιν ἀληθῶς καὶ τὸν φίλον πατέρα καὶ τὴν φίλην μητέρα καὶ πού γυναικα χρηστὴν ὄψεσθαι μὴ προσδοκῶντες.

θεωρεῖν \*: θηρεύειν. Cf. 1045 B: ἀποθεώρησιν γ ἀποθηρίωσιν O.

I know of no other passage where Epicureans are said to hunt for images of the dead, nor does such an activity seem consistent with the theory that any conceivable image occurs in our neighbourhood in any brief space of time.

θεωρεῖν corresponds to ὄψεσθαι as δέχεσθαι does to συνέσεσθαι.

*adversus Colotem.*

1110 E: τὸ γὰρ νόμῳ χροῖν ἐῖναι καὶ νόμῳ γλυκὺ καὶ νόμῳ πικρόν, <ἐτε., δὲ τὸ κενὸν καὶ> τὰς ἀτόμους. . . .

πικρόν \*: σύγκρισιν Ω.

<ἐτεῆ δὲ τὸ κενὸν καὶ> Wytttenbach: lacunam habent Ω.

It is absurd to say that there is anything 'conventional' about combination (of atoms presumably), for that is a fact ascertainable by reason. The passage must be corrected by comparison with the other places in which the same saying of Democritus is repeated, viz. Galen, *de medic. empir. frag.* and Sextus, *adv. M.* vii. 135 (*VS*<sup>4</sup> Democritus B. 125 and 9). Perhaps the error was due to a marginal note *κατὰ σύγκρισιν* (sc. *ἔστι χροὴ κτλ.*); cf. the note *κατὰ τὰς ἐμφύτους γνώσεις* found in the margin of X at 1035 F; but if the word *πικρόν* were partly illegible (for the reason which caused the following lacuna), it might have been read (in minuscule) as *σύγκρισιν*.

Mr. E. Harrison has very kindly read these notes; I have to thank him for several improvements suggested by him or due to his criticism.

F. H. SANDBACH.

TRINITY COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE

*Postscript to C.Q. xxxiii, p. 200*

At the above place I cast doubt upon the ascription to Plutarch of *frag. incert.* 114 (Bernardakis). That doubt can be confirmed. The source of the fragment is in fact Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, II, p. 219 Pott.

F. H. S.

ATHE  
ways  
theol  
other  
exact  
these  
show  
of Ea  
on hi  
found

The t  
these  
separ

W  
descr  
ians v  
for w  
We d  
luxur  
Xenc  
σκληρ  
ποιησ  
draw  
sugge  
see e  
μένου  
state  
ship  
it is  
which  
with  
Colop  
not t  
by a  
expla  
to te  
detai  
bega  
large

<sup>1</sup> F  
Edmo  
<sup>2</sup> A



### XENOPHANES, FRAGMENT 3

ATHENAEUS, xii. 526 a, quotes three elegiac couplets of Xenophanes on the luxurious ways which the men of Colophon learned from the Lydians.<sup>1</sup> Since the lines lack theological or metaphysical interest, they have not received so much attention as other fragments of Xenophanes, and few attempts have been made to unravel their exact meaning.<sup>2</sup> But it is rash to hurry over anything written by Xenophanes, and these lines are in their way as interesting as anything else that he wrote. For they show what he, a penetrating and serious critic, thought about one aspect of the impact of East on West, of barbarian on Greek, and they contain his only known judgement on historical events. On examination they raise more questions than are usually found in them. They may be quoted as Diels printed them:

ἀβροσύνας δὲ μαθόντες ἀνωφελέας παρὰ Λυδῶν,  
ὄφρα τυραννίδες ἦσαν ἀνὲν στυγερῆς,  
ἦσαν εἰς ἀγορὴν παναλουργέα φάρε' ἔχοντες,  
οὐ μείους ὥσπερ χίλιοι εἰς ἐπίπαν,  
αὐχαλῆοι, χαίτησιν ἀγαλλόμεν' εὐπρεπέεσσιν,  
ἀσκητοῖσ' ὁδμήν χρίμασι δευόμενοι.

The text is not certain, and there are serious difficulties in lines 4 and 5, but since these affect the interpretation of the whole, they may best be discussed in their separate contexts.

We ought first to decide what period of Colophonian history Xenophanes is describing. For this there should be a clue in line 2—it is a period when the Colophonians were still 'free from hateful tyranny'. But the clue does not take us any distance, for we know nothing about tyrants at Colophon in the seventh and sixth centuries. We do, however, know something about the most famous period of Colophonian luxury. Phylarchus (fr. 66 Jacoby), whom Athenaeus quotes just before he quotes Xenophanes, supplies an important fact when he says: *Κολοφώνιοι τὴν ἀρχὴν ὄντες σκληροὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀγωγαῖς, ἐπεὶ εἰς τρυφὴν ἐξώκειλαν πρὸς Λυδοῦς φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν ποιησάμενοι, προήεσαν διησκημένοι τὰς κόμας χρυσῷ κόσμῳ*. Phylarchus seems to have drawn his information directly from Xenophanes. For not only does Athenaeus suggest that the actual words of Xenophanes were quoted by Phylarchus, but we may see echoes of Xenophanes' *ἦσαν* and *ἀσκητοῖσ'* in Phylarchus' *προήεσαν* and *διησκημένοι*. Phylarchus must have had more of Xenophanes' poem than he quotes, and his statement that the period of luxury began when the Colophonians entered into friendship and alliance with the Lydians seems to be based on the text of Xenophanes where it is now lost. In any case, he gives a rough date for the beginning of the period to which Xenophanes refers: it was when the Colophonians formed a friendly alliance with the Lydians. Such good relations had not always existed. Gyges attacked Colophon and *τὸ ἄστυ ἐλλε* (Hdt. i. 14. 4), which has been taken to mean that he took not the citadel but only the lower town.<sup>3</sup> The change of relations may be explained by a passage in Polyaeus (vii. 2. 2) which connects the alliance with Alyattes and explains its origin in an ingenious trick by which the Lydian king brought Colophon to terms by depriving it of its famous cavalry. The story may not be accurate in its details, but it gives grounds for thinking that the alliance of Colophon and Lydia began in the time of Alyattes, whose dates are usually given as 613–560 B.C., and was largely determined by the collapse of the famous cavalry which had done good work

<sup>1</sup> Fr. 3 Diels, Bergk, Hudson-Williams, Diehl, studien', *Hermes*, 1925, pp. 178–80. Edmonds.

<sup>2</sup> D. G. Hogarth in *C.A.H.* iii, p. 508.

<sup>3</sup> An exception is H. Fraenkel's 'Xenophanes-

against Gyges in the plain of Hermus (Mimnermus, fr. 13) and was regarded by Strabo as one of the most noteworthy products of Colophon, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν παροιμίαν ἐκδοθῆναι τὴν λέγουσαν "τὸν Κολοφῶνα ἐπέθηκαν" ὅταν τέλος ἐπιτεθῇ βέβαιον τῷ πράγματι (643). The period of Lydian influence and luxury would seem to have been founded on what was a national failure for Colophon and would date from the years about 600 B.C. This gives a rough outline for the history of Colophon in the first half of the sixth century. First was the period of simplicity and independence based on the famous cavalry; second, the period of friendship with Lydia and of Asiatic luxury; third, the period of tyranny. At the close was the Persian conquest of 546 B.C., but whether this was the period of tyranny or whether the tyranny preceded it we cannot yet say.

The luxuries which Xenophanes mentions are purple garments, elaborate coiffure, and fragrant scents. In singling these out he is hardly exaggerating and need not be suspected of satire. For other evidence shows that such things were common both among Lydians and among Asiatic Greeks. Purple garments, for instance, were among the gifts sent by Croesus to Delphi (Hdt. i. 50. 1), and their popularity on the Asiatic seaboard may be seen from Sappho's references to them (frs. 55. 9; 56; 99 Diehl) and from Herodotus' account of the Phocaeen Pythermus at Sparta, πορφύρεον εἶμα περιβαλόμενος (i. 152. 1). Elaborate hair-dressing, as well as purple clothing, may be seen in the account of the Magnesian poet Magnes, who had a great success with Gyges and is handsomely described by Nicolaus of Damascus, ἡσκητο δὲ καὶ τὸ σῶμα διαπρεπεῖ κόσμῳ, ἀλουργῇ ἀμπεχόμενος καὶ κομὴν τρέφων χρυσῷ στρόφῳ κεκορμυβωμένῃν (fr. 62 Jacoby). Long, flowing hair was indeed common among Ionians at the time, and Asius of Samos describes the Samians of an earlier day than his own in a friendly spirit of mockery:

χρῦσαι δὲ κορύνβαι ἐπ' αὐτῶν τέττιγες ὥς,  
χαῖται δ' ἡωρεῦντ' ἀνέμῳ χρυσοῖς ἐνὶ δεσμοῖς.

(fr. 13. 4-5 Kinkel)

A bronze statuette from the Temple of Hera at Samos shows a man whose hair falls over his shoulders at the back in great waves and is dressed in front in four elegant ringlets,<sup>1</sup> while a marble head from the same place has an elaborate system of curls.<sup>2</sup> Even more popular than purple or elaborate coiffure was the use of Lydian scents. Athenaeus (xv. 690 a ff.) devotes a chapter to passages about them from Hipponax, Semonides, and Ion of Chios, while echoes of their use may be found in Sappho. For the βρενθεῖον to which she refers (fr. 96. 20) is said to be Lydian (Pollux vi. 104), and the 'royal' myrrh in the same poem may well be named after the king of Lydia. It is clear that the examples of luxury which Xenophanes gives are well based on fact and that he is not guilty of malicious or satirical exaggeration. We may conclude that his temper is entirely serious and that he really felt strongly about this intrusion of Lydian luxury into an Ionian society.

To these three examples of luxury we may perhaps add two, of no great importance but enough to give some more point to what Xenophanes has already said and to show that his condemnation was perhaps more comprehensive than the surviving lines indicate. The first comes from Phylarchus, who says that the Colophonians decorated their hair with gold ornaments. In the quotation from Xenophanes there is no mention of these. Hermann tries to remedy the defect by changing line 5 to

αὐχαλέοι χαίτης ἐν ἀγάλμασιν εὐπρεπέεσσιν

which is attractive and has the merit that it rids the line of an elision unexpected in elegiac verse. But the elision of final -οι is common enough in Alcaeus and Sappho<sup>3</sup> and is not impossible here. The change is not absolutely necessary, and if Phylarchus

<sup>1</sup> E. Buschor, *Altsamische Standbilder*, figs.

29, 31, 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, figs. 47-9.

<sup>3</sup> E. Lobel, *ΣΑΠΦΟΥΣ ΜΕΛΗ*, pp. lx-lxii.

had more of Xenophanes before him than we have, the reference to gold ornaments may well have been contained in lines now lost. And in any case Hermann's change does not mention gold. A second detail comes from the same source. Immediately after quoting our lines Athenaeus goes on to say, οὕτω δ' ἐξελύθησαν διὰ τὴν ἀκαίριον μέθην ὥστε τινὲς αὐτῶν οὐτε ἀνατέλλοντα τὸν ἥλιον οὐτε δυόμενον ἐωράκασιν. This looks like a paraphrase of actual words of Xenophanes, and J. M. Edmonds has ingeniously transposed them into verse:

οὐδέ τις ἥλιον εἶδεν ἀκαίριον οἶνοποτάζων  
οὐτε ποτ' ἀντέλλοντ' οὐτ' ἄρα δυόμενον.<sup>1</sup>

They suggest that the Colophonians learned their habits of untimely drunkenness from the Lydians. We need not accept this too literally, but the Lydians were certainly fond of wine. For Herodotus makes the Lydian Sandanis tell Croesus that the Persians are a very strange people because they do not drink wine, πρὸς δὲ οὐκ οἶνον διαχρέωνται ἀλλὰ ὕδροποτεύουσι (i. 71. 3), a characteristic as peculiar in his view as their abstention from figs. It is therefore possible that the drunkenness which Xenophanes seems to have deplored in Colophon was influenced by Lydian example. These two points supplement our picture of Colophonian luxury and confirm our view that Xenophanes was really shocked by it.

In Xenophanes' indictment there is a special sting. The luxuries, bad enough in themselves, were displayed by the Colophonians when they went εἰς ἀγορὴν. In antiquity this was taken to mean 'to the market-place'. So Theopompus took it when he paraphrased Xenophanes and wrote χιλίους ἀνδρας αὐτῶν ἀλουργεῖς φοροῦντας στολὰς ἀστυπολεῖν. ὁ δὲ καὶ βασιλεῦσιν σπάνιον τότε ἦν καὶ περισπούδαστον (fr. 117 Jacoby), and so Cicero when he translated freely *cotidiano in forum mille hominum cum palliis conchylio tinctis descenderent* (*De Rep.* vi. 2, p. 20. 11 Ziegler). This seems a reasonable explanation since the Agora was where the different members of a city saw each other, and such ostentation as this might well create a painful impression on the more modestly minded. This interpretation has, however, been questioned by H. Fraenkel, who argues that ἀγορὴ is not the market-place<sup>2</sup> but 'die beschliessende Versammlung der souveränen Bürgerschaft'. Such a meaning for the word is vouchsafed by Homer, who uses it of Achaean princes (*Il.* ii. 93), of the council of Alcinous (*Od.* viii. 109), and of the assembly on Ithaca (*Od.* ii. 69), by Herodotus, who applies it to the councils of the Ionians at the time of their revolt from Persia (vi. 11. 1), and by Theognis (268), who compares the absence of justice in the law-courts with a similar absence in the ἀγορά and implies that this is a political institution. The word seems suitable enough for an assembly of aristocrats, such as Fraenkel postulates, but he can hardly be right when he says 'denn unter der Tyrannis mussten diese Versammlungen aufhören'. For it is clear from Theopompus' paraphrase of the passage that the extravagant habits of the Colophonians were among the causes of tyranny and preceded it (fr. 117 Jacoby). In fact, Fraenkel's interpretation puts a considerable strain on the language. He has to take line 2 ὅφρα . . . στυγερῆς as referring only to line 1 and dependent on μαθόντες and to make line 3 describe a subsequent time when tyranny was already established. This might be possible if ὅφρα simply meant 'when', but since it means 'so long as' or 'while' it is unlikely to be dependent on the aorist participle μαθόντες, and this interpretation fails linguistically. It seems much better to take ὅφρα . . . στυγερῆς with the whole sentence and to assume that Xenophanes is writing of a time before tyranny was established and when such flaunting was possible. In that case there is no good reason for rejecting the view of Theopompus and Cicero that εἰς ἀγορὴν means simply 'to the market-place'. This was the centre of Greek life, and when the rich Colophonians showed themselves off in it, they did very much what the offensive

<sup>1</sup> *Elegy and Iambus*, i, p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 180.

man of Theophrastus does when he goes to the public square wearing both tunic and cloak (*Char.* xix. 7). The detail, such as it is, draws attention to his insensitive character.

We cannot, however, dismiss Fraenkel's interpretation of εἰς ἀγορὴν simply on these grounds. For it is part of a theory, shared by him with Wilamowitz,<sup>1</sup> that Xenophanes refers explicitly to a time in Colophon when the government belonged to 'The Thousand' and that it is to these that Xenophanes refers. In support of this contention they cite a passage of Aristotle (*Pol.* 1290<sup>b</sup>16) which, after discussing types of government which may be thought democracies but are not rightly so called, mentions a type in which the rule belongs to the rich because they exceed in number, οἷον ἐν Κολοφῶνι τὸ πάλαιον· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐκέκτηντο μακρὰν οὐσίαν οἱ πλείους πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸν πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς Λυδούς. But it seems impossible that Aristotle should refer to the same time and conditions as Xenophanes. The period 'before the war with the Lydians' cannot be identified with certainty. If it means the war with Gyges, it was long before the period described by Xenophanes; if it means the war with Alyattes, it preceded the period of luxury which he describes. For, as we have seen, this followed the peace and alliance with him. There is in fact no reason to think that the state of affairs described by Xenophanes was one in which the majority was rich. On the contrary it seems more likely that the rich displayed their wealth before the rest of the population and were disliked for so doing.

The belief in a government of 'The Thousand' in Colophon deserves a rather more critical examination than it has received. The chief evidence for it is adduced from these words of Xenophanes:

οὐ μείους ὥσπερ χίλιοι εἰς ἐπίπαν.

But before use can be made of this, the text and the grammar must be considered. Diehl puts οὐ μείους inside brackets and J. M. Edmonds suggests a change to ἢ ὥσπερ.<sup>2</sup> But the text is good Greek as it stands. For, as Hudson-Williams<sup>3</sup> and Kühner-Gerth<sup>4</sup> show, ὥς may be used in a comparison instead of ἢ, and examples such as Aesch. *P.V.* 629 μὴ μου προκῆδον μᾶσσον ὥς ἐμοὶ γλυκύ, *Lys.* vii. 31 ἅπαντα προθυμότερον πεποιήκα ὥς ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡναγκαζόμεν and Dem. xxv. 53 τοῦτον ὑμεῖς ἀδικούντα λαβόντες οὐ μόνον οὐ τιμωρήσεσθε, ἀλλὰ καὶ μειζόνων ἀξιώσαντες δωρεῶν ἀφήσετε ὥς τοὺς ἐνεργέτας; show that the text of Xenophanes is sound and means simply 'not less than a thousand'. Moreover, this is qualified by the words εἰς ἐπίπαν, and that makes a difference. Diels translates 'zumal' and Edmonds 'in all', but the meaning is probably more precise than either of these. The Ionic of Herodotus gives more than one example of ἐπίπαν in connexion with recurring events, as in ii. 68. 5 ἔωθε γὰρ τοῦτο ὥς τὸ ἐπίπαν ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸν ζέφυρον, iv. 86. 1 νηὺς ἐπίπαν μάλιστα κη κατανύει μακρομερέη ὀργυίας ἐπτακισμυρίας, vi. 46. 3 ἐκ μὲν γε τῶν ἐκ Σκαπτῆς Ὑλῆς τῶν χρυσέων μετάλλων τὸ ἐπίπαν ὀγδῶκοντα τάλαντα προσήιε. He uses the word to mean 'usually' or 'on an average'. Xenophanes, also an Ionian, surely uses the word in the same way and means that usually or on an average a thousand Colophonians went to the public square in their full finery.

The point is of some importance; for it is relevant to Wilamowitz's interpretation of the passage. He thinks that the words refer to 'die Oligarchie der 1000, die Aristoteles beschreibt'.<sup>5</sup> His words seem to be based on some confusion. For Aristotle does not describe any governing class of 'The Thousand' at Colophon. In *Pol.* 1290<sup>b</sup>, which Wilamowitz quotes, no figure for the 'majority' is mentioned, while Heraclides' excerpt from Aristotle is equally uninforming when it says ἱπποτρόφοι δ' εἰσὶν ὅν

<sup>1</sup> *Sappho und Simonides*, p. 277.

<sup>2</sup> *Elegy and Iambus*, i, p. 195.

<sup>3</sup> *Early Greek Elegy*, p. 103.

<sup>4</sup> *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*, II. ii, p. 304.

<sup>5</sup> *Sappho und Simonides*, p. 284.



τρόπον καὶ Κολοφώνιοι, πεδιάδα χώραν ἔχοντες (fr. 51 Rose). Nor is there any evidence that in the sixth century the government of Colophon was in the hands of an oligarchy of a thousand members. Such oligarchies existed at Locri (Polyb. xii. 16), Croton (Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 35, 260) and Rhegium (Her. Pont. fr. 55 Rose). These examples come from the West and may have owed their existence to a single law-giver like Charondas at Rhegium. But they seem also to have existed in the East. For at the Asiatic Cyme Prometheus limited the government to a class of a thousand (Her. Pont. fr. 39 Rose). If such a system existed at Cyme, it may also have existed at Colophon, but there is no evidence for it there, and it is unlikely that Xenophanes refers to it. For if he were really describing a display of wealth in public by the whole of a governing 'Thousand', he would not say 'not less than a thousand as a rule', for this implies that more could join in the display and sometimes did, nor would he omit the definite article which is necessary for any such class as is here believed to take part. He refers not to a class of 'The Thousand' but simply to a large number of rich Colophonians. His point is that there was always a multitude of them. In using such language he follows poetical tradition which often uses a thousand as a round figure for a large number, and there is no more need to take him literally than there is to take Homer's account of the thousand watch-fires before Troy (*Il.* viii. 562) as an exact statement of fact.

Xenophanes does not aim his criticism at a kind of government but at a class of persons, the rich of Colophon. Nor is he concerned with their political power, but with their behaviour in public. The main direction of his attack shows itself in the words *ἀνωφέλειας* and *αὐγαλείοι*, in which he reveals an attitude towards luxurious living which is more than surprising in an Ionian Greek of the sixth century. Neither Homer nor Hesiod mentions *ἀβροσύνη*, nor does it seem to occupy any place in Greek thought until contact with the East brought new standards of comfort. Its Oriental character may be seen first in Stesichorus, who uses the adverb *ἀβρῶς* in connexion with Phrygian music (fr. 14. 2 Diehl). The Delphic oracle called Croesus *Λυδὲ ποδαβρῆ* (Hdt. i. 55. 2), Bacchylides applies *ἀβροβάτας* to an attendant on Croesus (iii. 48), and Aeschylus to the Persians (*Pers.* 1072), and no doubt Pindar had the notion of Oriental luxury in mind when he spoke of the *ἀβροτάς* of Troy (*Pyth.* xi. 34). So more emphatically Herodotus contrasts the older generation of Persians with those who came under Lydian influence, *Πέρσῃσι γὰρ πρὶν Λυδοὺς καταστρέψασθαι ἦν οὔτε ἀβρόν οὔτε ἀγαθόν οὐδέν* (i. 71. 4) and Aeschylus speaks of *ἀβροδιαίτων* *Λυδῶν ὄχλος* (*Pers.* 41).<sup>1</sup> This kind of *ἀβροσύνη* was especially connected with Lydia, and it is this which Xenophanes decries.

It was also common to ascribe such delicate living to the Asiatic Greeks and their neighbours on the islands. Bacchylides calls the Ionians *ἀβρόβιοι* (xviii. 2), and Antiphanes speaks of *Ἰώνων ἀβρός ἡδοναθῆς ὄχλος* (fr. 91 Kock). But in the sixth and fifth centuries words of this kind seldom carried any note of disapproval. For Bacchylides uses his phrase in a Dithyramb for Athenians about Athenians, while Herodotus significantly associates *ἀβρόν* with *ἀγαθόν*. We can see from other writers that to claim *ἀβροσύνη* for oneself or others was by no means a form of depreciation. Sappho uses the adjective of the Graces (fr. 90 Diehl) and the adverb of Aphrodite (fr. 6), and even seems to claim a personal love of luxury when she says *ἐγὼ δὲ φίλημι' ἀβροσύναν* (fr. 65, 25). So Anacreon uses the adverb of playing the lyre (fr. 69) and the adjective of Eros (fr. 28). Nor is the word confined to the more pleasure-loving poets. Solon speaks of his own comforts

γαστρί τε καὶ πλευρῇ καὶ ποσὶν ἀβρὰ παθεῖν (fr. 14. 4)

and since his whole passage reappears in the Theognidean corpus (719-28), we may assume that its sentiments met with some approval. There seems in fact to have

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Kranz, *Stasimon*, p. 84.

been little serious hostility to Oriental luxury or to ἀβροσύνη at all among Greeks before Xenophanes or among his contemporaries. Even after him it was commonly regarded as one of life's good things. When Thucydides describes how the older generation of Athenians adopted Ionian ways διὰ τὸ ἀβροδαίον and changed εἰς τὸ τρυφερώτερον (i. 6. 3), he does not express any open disapproval. On this point Xenophanes was unusually and surprisingly puritanical.

For his disapproval Xenophanes had a reason—such luxuries are 'useless'. In this judgement he shows the same spirit in which he condemns rewards to athletic victors because they do not enrich the city:

οὐ γὰρ παίνει ταῦτα μυχὸς πόλιος

(fr. 2. 22)

or songs τοῖσ' οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστι (fr. 1. 23). All three cases are in his view unprofitable and perhaps worse. When he condemns ἀβροσύνας as ἀνωφελέας, the question for him is social and civic, and he judges it as a responsible citizen rather in the same spirit as that in which Aristophanes praises Homer ὅτι χρηστ' ἐδίδαξε (*Ran.* 1035) or Plato condemns the oligarchic man because he despises moderation μετὰ πολλῶν καὶ ἀνωφελῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν (*Rep.* viii. 560d). But whereas these later writers are concerned with broad principles of life and politics Xenophanes is concerned with a particular historical fact. He deplored this Lydian luxury because it led to the rise of tyranny in Colophon. For as Theopompus, after paraphrasing these lines, says, τοιγαροῦν διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην ἀγωγὴν ἐν τυραννίδι καὶ στάσει γενόμενοι αὐτῇ πατρίδι διεφθάρησαν (fr. 117 Jacoby), and even without this evidence we might have guessed that Xenophanes pointed such a moral. Flaunting extravagance and hateful tyranny must have been connected in his argument, and he must have maintained that the first was the cause of the second.

That tyranny might be the fruit of unjust behaviour, or a punishment for it, is a doctrine familiar from Solon and Theognis. The first deplores the arrogance of the Athenian nobles and foresees that they will be subjected to a tyrant (fr. 3. 17-18); the second anticipates that his city will give birth to a tyrant to chastise the prevalent ὕβρις (39-40). That the Colophonians were well known for their arrogance is clear from the proverb Κολοφωνία ὕβρις which was used ἐπὶ τῶν πλουσίων καὶ ὕβριστῶν (Diogen. v. 79). Xenophanes was concerned with such ὕβρις as his adjective αὐχαλέοι shows, but with a special form of it, the arrogant display of wealth. A similar disapproval may be seen in Solon's attack on the wanton feasting of the Athenian nobles:

οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον οὐδὲ παρούσας  
εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.

(fr. 3. 9-10)

On this point Solon and Xenophanes disagreed with most of their contemporaries. They saw that an insolent display of wealth might produce such hostility that it would create the kind of opposition which was led by a future tyrant, as it was in Lesbos by Pittacus. This was something different from the disapproval of τρυφή as such in Plato and later writers. It was based on sound political reasons, and in Xenophanes' experience such a display led to tyranny and to the collapse of Colophon.

Xenophanes applies in his own way a doctrine of ὕβρις which is as old as Hesiod (*Op.* 238-41) to his own times and sees it as a real and actual problem. He seems to have known and described a sequence of events which followed the alliance with Lydia: first unbounded extravagance and display among the rich, then tyranny and στάσις, then the destruction of Colophon. That cities fell from pride and luxury was a belief as old as Callinus, who explained the fall of Magnesia on the Maeander διὰ τὸ πλεόν ἀνεθῆναι (Athen. xii. 525 c). In that case the fall made a great stir in the Greek world and was mentioned by Archilochus (fr. 19). It seems to have taken place about 700 B.C. and to have been the work of the Ephesians (Clem. *Strom.* i, p. 333 P.; Plin.

*N.H.* vii. 38, xxxv. 8).<sup>1</sup> Yet despite its early date it was connected with the fall of Colophon. For while it is recorded as a unique case in one Theognidean couplet,

τοιάδε καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσεν ἔργα καὶ ὕβρις,  
οἷα τὰ νῦν ἱερὴν τήνδε πόλιν κατέχει, (603-4)

another couplet associates it with the fall of Smyrna and of Colophon:

ὕβρις καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα  
καὶ Σμύρνην· πάντως, Κύρνε, καὶ ὕμ' ἀπολεῖ. (1103-4)

For some reason Smyrna and Colophon were thought worthy to be added to Magnesia as classic examples of the pride which leads to a fall. We do not know the date of the first couplet, though Bergk thought that it was the work of Callinus; but since Cynrus is addressed in the second we may assume that it is genuinely by Theognis and dates from the sixth century. So at some date in the long lifetime of Xenophanes the fall of Colophon had become a typical case of disaster and was almost proverbial even outside Asia Minor.

Magnesia fell to the Ephesians about 700 B.C. The fall of Smyrna cannot be its capture by Gyges, which seems to have been little more than a raid (*Hdt.* i. 14. 4), and is probably its capture by Alyattes (*id.* i. 16). After this the inhabitants deserted the ruined town and settled in villages without restoring their old homes or organization (*Strab.* xiv. 646). Such a disappearance from history might well be compared with the collapse of Magnesia. But what happened to Colophon that it should be compared with Magnesia and Smyrna? Theognis certainly suggests that it was a great disaster, and it is all the more remarkable that we know nothing about it and must resort to conjecture. It must have come, as we have seen, after the alliance with Alyattes. In this period the most likely enemies were first the Lydians under Croesus and then the Persians under Cyrus and his generals. It seems unlikely that Croesus is the villain. For since he made the Ionian cities pay tribute (*Hdt.* i. 27. 1), he can hardly have destroyed one of the richest of them, and Herodotus' silence about any attack by him on Colophon makes it unlikely that he did great harm to it. For Herodotus is well-informed and informative about Croesus. On the other hand, it seems likely that Colophon was destroyed by the Persians. Herodotus passes rapidly over their conquest of Ionia, but it may well have had its ugly chapters. The capture of Colophon by them left its mark on Xenophanes. For he refers to the arrival of the Mede as if it were an important turning-point in his own life (fr. 22). Moreover, his reputed share in the foundation of Elea (*Clem. Strom.* i. 353) is well explained if his countrymen were forced by the Persian invasion to share the fate and adventures of the Phocaeans oversea. It is conceivable that Colophon suffered badly at the hands of the Persians and that its fall made so great an impression on contemporary opinion that Theognis thought fit to place it with the classic examples of Magnesia and Smyrna, while Xenophanes, who knew it from the inside, described the fatal historical process which made the disaster inevitable.

These considerations, flimsy though some of them are, show that Xenophanes applied to recent history the same seriousness and public sense which he applied to such contemporary customs as the paying of high rewards to Olympic victors and that he ranged himself on the side of such thinkers as Solon. His whole attitude to the gay, irresponsible past of the Colophonian aristocracy is critical, even hostile. His lines present a remarkable contrast to the lines in which Asius of Samos at a later date makes genial fun of the good old days when men wore top-knots and bracelets and covered the floor with their flowing robes (fr. 13 Kinkel). For Asius this was already an almost legendary past; he looked back to it with the same humorous wistfulness that Aristophanes felt towards the Marathonian age. But for Xenophanes this past

<sup>1</sup> A. A. Blakeway in *Greek Poetry and Life*, pp. 45-6.

was recent and painful. His country had been conquered and ruined, and he seems to have felt that part of the blame belonged to its wealthy citizens, who had shirked their responsibilities and devoted themselves to an unprofitable and unpopular display of their wealth. The Ionian temper which he deplores was no exceptional thing in the history of his age. The love of luxury and the dissensions which it bred were to be displayed a few years later in the Ionian revolt when the battle of Lade was lost because the Ionian seamen would not submit to discipline and ruined their cause by quarrels and disorder (Hdt. vi. 11-14). There, too, the result was Persian domination. The brilliant Ionian life of the sixth century lacked strength to survive against foreign force and organization. Xenophanes saw this and passed judgement on those who had in his opinion ruined his country.

We do not know from what poem these lines come, nor indeed what kind of a poem it was. The elegiac poem varied much in length and character, and the scanty remains which survive from most early elegists give little indication of what scale their poets used. The other elegiac fragments of Xenophanes, certainly frs. 1 and 2, come from symposiac elegies and show to what serious themes this form could be turned. From such a poem these lines too may come. But there was also a kind of historical poem written in elegiacs. That this could be used for history of a not too remote past is shown by the fragment of Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* which tells of the wars between Smyrna and Gyges.<sup>1</sup> Other such poems were the two books of elegiacs in which Semonides of Amorgos told the history of Samos (Suidas, s.v. *Σημωνίδης*) and the *Ionica* of Panyassis which told of Codrus, Neleus, and the Ionian migration and was surely written in elegiacs, since Suidas (s.v. *Πανύσσις*) describes it as *ἐν πενταμέτρῳ*. It is certain that Xenophanes wrote narrative poems, since Diogenes Laertius credits him with a *Κολοφώνος κτίσις* and *ὁ εἰς Ἑλέαν τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀποικισμὸς* in 2000 *ἔπη*. The last word is ambiguous, but though it is commonly used of the epic hexameter, it can also be used of any line of poetry and may possibly refer to elegiacs. The account of the luxurious Colophonians may conceivably come from this poem or from another like it and belong to a passage which described the events leading to the departure from Asia Minor to Italy. If so, it would indicate that Xenophanes brought to his historical narrative the same seriousness and ethical interest that he brought to his discussion of theology.

C. M. BOWRA.

<sup>1</sup> *Antimachi Reliquiae*, ed. B. Wyss, p. 83.

FOLLOW  
of the  
Singul  
an art  
the us  
singul  
observ  
review  
gantia  
use of  
stance  
one of  
the co  
as foll  
(b) the  
Conwa  
pp. 12  
15, 16  
Latein  
Reque  
a prod  
or writ  
Virgil  
For th  
conne  
Virgil  
Dome  
Plural  
Be  
that,  
Ego c  
them.  
suppo  
and, i  
exper  
not w  
frequ  
cautio  
place

E  
(quot  
<sup>1</sup> N  
to all  
noster  
No po  
include  
<sup>2</sup> C.



## THE SINGULAR USE OF NOS<sup>1</sup> IN VIRGIL

FOLLOWING the example of the late Professor R. S. Conway, who in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. v, part i (1899), discussed 'The Use of the Singular *Nos* in Cicero's Letters', I examined Catullus' employment of the idiom in an article published in *Mnemosyne*, series iii, vol. vii, fasc. 2 (1938), pp. 148-56. While the usage of Catullus exemplified various of Conway's indisputable types of the singular *nos*, such as the Plural of Authorship and the Plural of Proprietorship, my observations did not confirm his main thesis of a 'projective' use, which L. C. Purser reviewing his monograph called 'a *Pluralis Dignitatis* or *Fiducia*, not to say *Adrogantiae*', in direct contrast to the orthodox *pluralis modestiae*.<sup>2</sup> I found that, where the use of *nos* related to a state of mind of the writer or speaker, not merely to circumstances of his environment, the usage in Catullus was either a *pluralis modestiae* or one of several derivative types. My examination of Virgil seems wholly to confirm the conclusions reached concerning Catullus, whose types of singular *nos* I classified as follows: (a) the Plural of Proprietorship (see Conway, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 and 33 ff.); (b) the Traveller's Plural (see Conway, *ibid.*, pp. 10 and 70); (c) the Local Plural (see Conway, *ibid.*, pp. 10, 69, and 70); (d) the Plural of Authorship (see Conway, *ibid.*, pp. 12, 18, 33); (e) the Social and Domestic Plural (see Conway, *ibid.*, pp. 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 40 ff.); (f) the *pluralis modestiae* (see Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausführliche Lateinische Grammatik*, vol. ii, part i (1912), pp. 87-9); (g) the Plural of Pleading or Requesting; (h) the Plural of Pathos or Self-pity. Of these (a), (b), (c), and (e) are a product of circumstances of environment and relate to a group of which the speaker or writer is a member; (d), (f), (g), and (h) express an attitude or state of mind. Virgil's examples of the usage fall into six of these categories, (b) and (c) being absent. For the purposes of the present study I shall, in order to indicate more clearly the connexion between (a) and (e), and the subjective character of (d), number the six Virgilian categories as follows: (i) the Plural of Proprietorship; (ii) the Social and Domestic Plural; (iii) the Plural of Authorship; (iv) the *pluralis modestiae*; (v) the Plural of Pleading or Requesting; (vi) the Plural of Pathos, Self-pity, or Complaint.

Before submitting the examples to the reader's judgement, I must stress the fact that, as Conway pointed out, the use of *nos* for *ego* is 'permissive, not necessary'. *Ego* could in every case be used for *nos*, and the poet frequently oscillates between them. But certain contexts are especially favourable to the use of *nos*, and we may suppose that the judicious admixture of the plural in such contexts created a pleasing, and, in some instances, a highly poetic effect. I shall be happy if the reader comes to experience the often intensely poetic quality of the Plural of Pathos; but I shall be not wholly dissatisfied if this study achieves no more than to remind him of the frequency with which *nos* in Virgil bears the meaning 'I', and to make him more cautious than the translators.<sup>3</sup> As is inevitable, some examples belong to, or could be placed in, more than one of the categories.

### (i) THE PLURAL OF PROPRIETORSHIP

*Ecl.* i. 8 (*illius aram Saepe tener nostris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus*). *Ecl.* i. 43 (*quotannis Bis senos cui nostra dies altaria fumant*). *Ecl.* i. 80 (*sunt nobis initia*

<sup>1</sup> *Nos* is to be taken throughout as referring to all forms of the first person plural, viz. *nos*, *noster*, and the verbal forms in *-mus* and *-mur*. No poem in the *Appendix Vergiliana* has been included in this study.

<sup>2</sup> *C.R.*, vol. xiv (1900), pp. 138-40.

<sup>3</sup> To select a few bad examples from the presumably most widely used of the delinquents, the Loeb translator uses the English plural in translating *Aen.* ii. 651, iii. 325-7, v. 742, vi. 465, and x. 19.

poma). *Ecl.* iii. 44 (et nobis<sup>1</sup> idem Alcimedon duo pocula fecit). *Ecl.* iii. 67 (notior ut iam sit canibus non Delia nostris). *Ecl.* viii. 37 (saepibus in nostris). *Georg.* iv. 445 (quis te, iuvenum confidentissime, nostras<sup>2</sup> Iussit adire domos?). *Aen.* i. 627 (tectis, iuvenes, succedite nostris).<sup>3</sup> *Aen.* vi. 151 (nostroque in limine pendes). *Aen.* vi. 388 (qui nostra ad flumina tendis). *Aen.* viii. 123 (nostris<sup>3</sup> succedere penetibus hospes). *Aen.* ix. 92 (prosit nostris<sup>3</sup> in montibus ortas).

Of this usage Conway writes: 'the plural is commonly preferred to the singular in speaking of estates, or other property, which are enjoyed, though not possessed, by others'. Virgil's examples show an instructive gradation. In *Ecl.* iii. 67 and viii. 37, and in *Aen.* viii. 123 a son of the house uses *noster* of family property, and the meaning is in effect plural rather than singular. In *Ecl.* i. 8, 43, and 80 and *Aen.* i. 627<sup>4</sup> the true owner uses the plural of property whose use is shared with family or servants. *Ecl.* iii. 44 shows the plural in relation to articles of personal possession not normally shared; and in *Georg.* iv. 445 and *Aen.* vi. 151, 388, and ix. 92 we have the plural used of the solitary haunts of supernatural or divine beings.

#### (ii) THE SOCIAL AND DOMESTIC PLURAL

*Ecl.* i. 30 (postquam nos Amaryllis habet). *Ecl.* vii. 59 (Phyllidis adventu nostrae nemus omne virebit). *Aen.* xii. 42 (natam et conubia nostra petentem).

Kinsfolk and friends are, like property, shared with other members of one's family or circle. Here again there is a gradation from the true plural to the singular use of *nos*, which can be observed by comparing such passages as *Ecl.* vii. 70 and ix. 22 with the examples cited above. *Aen.* xii. 42 is a borderline case. In *Ecl.* i. 30 and vii. 59 the reference is to a mistress, in which connexion *nostra* is familiar to readers of Catullus and the elegiac poets.

#### (iii) THE PLURAL OF AUTHORSHIP

*Ecl.* iii. 84 (Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam). *Ecl.* vi. 2 (prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu Nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalia). *Ecl.* vi. 10 (te nostrae, Vare, myricae, Te nemus omne canet). *Ecl.* vii. 21 (nymphae, noster amor, Libethrides). *Georg.* ii. 40 (o famae merito pars maxima nostrae, Maecenas). *Georg.* ii. 541 (sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus aequor). *Georg.* iii. 1 (te memorande canemus Pastor ab Amphryso). *Georg.* iii. 40 (Dryadum silvas saltusque sequamur Intactos). *Georg.* iii. 285 (singula dum capti circumvectamur amore). *Aen.* vii. 733 (nec tu carminibus nostris indictus abibis).

I have placed this type next to the two in which the plural is due to circumstances of environment because, like them, it had, in Conway's words, 'become almost if not entirely conventionalised', and is in practice related to the quasi-external fact of authorship rather than to an attitude of mind. But to an attitude of mind it must in the first instance have been referable. If an author calls himself *nos* in his capacity of proprietor, friend, or relative, he describes himself as one of an authentic group. If he calls himself *nos* in his capacity of writer, he does not mean 'we men of letters'. The usage must have originated in a mental attitude whose most characteristic variation is to be found in the following category, that of the *pluralis modestiae*. This mental attitude is that which shrinks from undue prominence, which instinctively seeks to conceal the uncomfortable Ego in a larger unit. But this larger unit, unlike the groups implied in (i) and (ii), has only an imaginary existence: it is an illusion conjured up to satisfy the mental needs of the moment. But of this more will be said below. As for the Plural of Authorship, the writer, unless he be an autobiographer, cannot but feel that his Ego is an intruder in his pages. The intruder is, however, likely

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps (iv).

<sup>2</sup> Also a complaint (vi).

<sup>3</sup> Also (v).

<sup>4</sup> Lines 631-2 show that *nostris* is here singular.

to show himself at times, and more frequently in a didactic work like the *Georgics* than in a narrative one like the *Aeneid*. But when he appears where he has really no right to be, he tends to be in some measure stripped of the insignia of his individuality, to masquerade as the anonymous *nos* rather than the individual *ego*. This proceeding is very similar to that of the *pluralis modestiae*, and may well have been originally identical, though it later became an automatic convention. The reader will in fact notice that a number of the Virgilian instances quoted could equally well be placed in category (iv). In *Georg.* ii. 541, iii. 1, iii. 40, iii. 285, and *Aen.* vii. 733 the author refers directly to his works or to his profession; in *Georg.* ii. 40 he envisages his literary fame; and in *Ecl.* iii. 84, vi. 2, vi. 10, and vii. 21 *noster* is applied to symbols of poetic effort and achievement, the symbol being in three instances the Muses.

(iv) THE *PLURALIS MODESTIAE*

*Ecl.* i. 6 (deus *nobis*<sup>1</sup> haec otia fecit). *Ecl.* i. 63 (ante . . . Quam *nostro* illius labatur pectore vultus). *Ecl.* ii. 62 (*nobis* placeant ante omnia silvae). *Ecl.* iii. 108 (non *nostrum* inter vos tantas componere lites). *Ecl.* v. 18 (iudicio *nostro* tantum tibi cedit Amyntas). *Ecl.* v. 45 (tale tuum carmen *nobis*, divine poeta, Quale sopor fessis). *Ecl.* v. 50-2 (*nos* tamen haec quocumque modo tibi *nostra* vicissim *Dicemus*, Daphnimque tuum *tollemus* ad astra; Daphnim ad astra *feremus*: amavit *nos* quoque Daphnis). *Ecl.* v. 53 (an quicquam *nobis* tali sit munere maius?). *Ecl.* v. 55 (ista Iam pridem Stimichon laudavit carmina *nobis*). *Ecl.* v. 85-6 (hac te *nos* fragili *donabimus* ante cicuta. Haec *nos* 'formosum Corydon ardebat Alexim', Haec eadem docuit 'cuium pecus? an Meliboei?'). *Ecl.* vii. 35 (nunc te marmoreum pro tempore *fecimus*). *Ecl.* x. 26 (Pan deus Arcadiae venit, quem *vidimus ipsi*). *Aen.* ii. 89 (dum stabat regno incolumis regumque vigeat Conciliis, et *nos* aliquod nomenque decusque *Gessimus*). *Aen.* iii. 461 (haec sunt quae *nostra* liceat te voce moneri). *Aen.* vii. 259 (di *nostra*<sup>2</sup> incepta secudent Auguriumque suum!). *Aen.* vii. 263 (ipse modo Aeneas, *nostri* si tanta cupido est, . . . Adveniat). *Aen.* vii. 439 (nec regia Iuno Immemor est *nostri*). *Aen.* ix. 404 (tu, dea, tu praesens *nostro*<sup>2</sup> succurre labori). *Aen.* x. 481 (aspice num mage sit *nostrum* penetrabile telum!). *Aen.* xi. 343 (rem nulli obscuram *nostrae* nec vocis egentem). *Aen.* xi. 789 (da, pater, hoc *nostris*<sup>2</sup> aboleri dedecus armis, Omnipotens). *Aen.* xii. 50-1 (et *nos* tela, pater, ferrumque haud debile dextra *Spargimus*, et *nostro* sequitur de vulnere sanguis). *Aen.* xii. 142 (nympha, decus fluviorum, animo gratissima *nostro*). *Aen.* xii. 187 (sin *nostrum* adnuerit *nobis* Victoria Martem).

In a context which, for one reason or another, requires a tone of modesty, the less obtrusive *nos*, in the use of which a portion of the personality has been shed, tends to replace the more individualistic and personal *ego*, and the meaning approaches that of the English 'such as I', or 'the likes of me'. But it must be remembered that few attitudes are more commonly feigned than modesty, and so we find a gradation from ingenuous modesty, through modest self-assertion, to what Purser, in his review of Conway's monograph, called 'a pride that was aping humility'. As a most common motive for modesty is comparison of oneself with another, we frequently find *nos* in antithesis to a noun or pronoun designating another person. The Virgilian instances of the *pluralis modestiae* show an interesting variety of motives. A common one is the presence, contemplation, or mention of a superior being, sometimes a divinity, or of one whom self-effacing courtesy treats as superior. In *Ecl.* i. 6 and 63 the superior being is Octavian. In *Ecl.* ii. 62 *nobis* is in opposition to Pallas, in v. 45 to 'divine poeta', while in x. 26 we have the modest amazement of a mortal who has gazed on the god Pan. *Aen.* ii. 89 is a typical instance of modest self-assertion;<sup>3</sup> Palamedes'

<sup>1</sup> The correspondence of *haec otia* to the picture of repose in lines 1-2 introduced by *tu* leads me to regard *nobis* as singular.

<sup>2</sup> Also (v).

<sup>3</sup> See *Mnemosyne*, series iii, vol. vii, fasc. 2 (1938), pp. 150-1, and cf. Cicero, in *Catilinam*,

position of power shed some reflected glory on his squire. In *Aen.* iii. 461 '*nostra* . . . voce' refers to the modest prophetic powers of Helenus, as compared with those of the Sibyl described in the preceding lines. In *Aen.* vii. 259 *nostra* expresses the helplessness of human endeavour, which requires divine aid, and in vii. 263 *nostri*, if singular, is an expression of modest surprise at the flattering request sent by Aeneas. *Aen.* vii. 439, ix. 404, and xi. 789, two of which are pleas, further illustrate the *pluralis modestiae* in presence of, or in reference to, a divinity. In *Ecl.* iii. 108 and v. 18 we have an interesting variation, the modest hesitation of one called upon, or presuming, to judge between rivals. The instances in *Ecl.* v are, taken as a whole, of great interest in that they have a dramatic value, contributing to the delineation of the two characters in the Eclogue. Menalcas, although the elder, is the more modest, and has no difficulty in persuading Mopsus to sing first. Both before and after Mopsus' song he uses the *pluralis modestiae* in deference to him (lines 18 and 45), and lines 50-2 introduce his own song with an excess of self-abasement to which Mopsus is in courtesy bound to reply in kind (lines 53 and 55). When Menalcas' song is finished, it is in the conventional order of things that Mopsus should compliment him and ask him to name his prize, but the modest Menalcas will not be the first to receive a prize, and offers instead to Mopsus what he describes as an old, well-used pipe (lines 85-6): Mopsus is in no way modest about the crook which he offers in return. In *Ecl.* vii. 35, if the meaning is really singular, we have the deprecatory modesty of a poor farmer who feels that his humble statue is unworthy of the god to whom it is dedicated. *Aen.* x. 481, xi. 343, xii. 50-1, and xii. 187 are variations of mock-modesty. In x. 481 the modesty is completely sarcastic, and in xi. 343 Drances, previously described as a jealous and rancorous creature with an inferiority complex, speaks like Uriah Heep; xii. 50-1 shows modest self-assertion; and in xii. 187 Aeneas, who is full of calm self-confidence, uses the plural of modesty to avoid giving the impression of ὕβρις. Finally, we have in *Aen.* xii. 142 an example of ingratiating modesty. Juno, having led Turnus and Juturna on to destruction in order to gratify her own ambition and spite, has an awkward task in confessing to the unhappy nymph that all is lost; and the circumstance of Juturna's seduction and desertion by Jupiter is an additional cause of embarrassment. So she addresses her as an equal ('diva deam', line 139), and in deference to her employs the *pluralis modestiae* as a form of 'captatio benevolentiae'. This ingratiating tone is characteristic of the category which follows.

#### (v) THE PLURAL OF PLEADING OR REQUESTING

*Ecl.* i. 18 (sed tamen iste deus qui sit, da, Tityre, *nobis*). *Ecl.* viii. 81 (limus ut hic durescit, et haec ut cera liquescit, Uno eodemque igni, sic *nostro* Daphnis amore). *Aen.* i. 676 (qua facere id possis *nostram* nunc accipe mentem). *Aen.* ii. 707 (cervi imponere *nostrae*). *Aen.* iv. 237 (hic *nostri* nuntius esto). *Aen.* iv. 612 (*nostras* audite preces). *Aen.* iv. 625 (exoriare aliquis *nostris* ex ossibus ultor). *Aen.* v. 391 (ubi nunc *nobis* deus ille . . . Eryx?). *Aen.* vii. 332 (hunc mihi da proprium, virgo sata Nocte, laborem, Hanc operam, ne *noster* honos infractave cedat Fama loco). *Aen.* xii. 800 (desine iam tandem precibusque inflectere *nostris*).

In the article in *Mnemosyne*, to which I have referred above, I wrote of this and of the succeeding category: 'Hitherto we have dealt with acknowledged uses of the singular *nos*; (g) and (h)' involve interpretations that are, to the best of my knowledge, new, but not, I think, revolutionary.' My investigation of Virgil's usage has confirmed my conviction that these two categories, and the proposed interpretations, are consistent with orthodox traditions of grammar, wherein they differ from Conway's adventures in uncharted seas. The reader will not fail to notice how categories (iv), IV. x. 21, an ideal example of this type of *pluralis modestiae*.

<sup>1</sup> (g) and (h) corresponded to the present (v) and (vi).

(v)  
sing  
(iv)  
pat  
pat  
in  
grad  
dial  
vol.  
beg  
for  
hav  
plur  
hum  
mor  
spea  
brus  
infor  
iv. 2  
exan  
rema  
plura

E  
prae  
nostr  
lupus  
*Ecl.*  
oculi  
perve  
'haec  
versa  
Paen  
ducis  
neque  
illum  
Sitho  
ulmo,  
cedam  
praece  
doluis  
Effug  
que la  
ii. 643

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  
7 and  
<sup>2</sup> No  
line is  
<sup>3</sup> If  
plurals.  
<sup>4</sup> Lik



(v), and (vi) dovetail and overlap; and (iv) represents a traditional explanation of the singular *nos*. We have seen that, as indicated in note 2, p. 129, several passages in (iv) contained pleas, and several united with modesty a humble wistfulness akin to pathos. Moreover, we shall see that several of the passages in category (v) contain pathetic pleas that could justly be included in category (vi), and that several passages in (vi) could be placed in (v). When we examine the present category, we find gradation from a simple request to an earnest entreaty. For the corresponding dialectal and colloquial use in English, see *A New English Dictionary* (Oxford), vol. x, part i, p. 466, col. 3. When a child pleads 'give us a bite of your apple', or a beggar 'could you spare a poor fellow a copper', each avoids mention of himself, for one or both of two motives, half-consciously conceived. The Ego, humiliated by having to beg, shrinks back and evades the humiliation by the use of the vaguer plural or generic term; also, the self-effacement of the Ego is an act of ingratiating humility calculated to secure the request. In cases where, in Latin, the request is more akin to a command than to a plea, we may suppose that the effacement of the speaker's individuality is an act of instinctive courtesy, designed to soften the brusqueness of command. Of the Virgilian examples two contain a request for information,<sup>1</sup> viz. *Ecl.* i. 18 and, if *nobis* is singular, *Aen.* v. 391. *Aen.* i. 676, ii. 707, iv. 237, and vii. 332 contain commands or requests of various kinds, *noster* in the last example also expressing a self-pity that makes it referable to category (vi). All the remaining passages contain pleas, and in each, with the exception of *Aen.* xii. 800, the plural expresses a pathos that would justify its inclusion in category (vi).

(vi) THE PLURAL OF PATHOS, SELF-PITY, OR COMPLAINT

*Ecl.* i. 16 (*saepe malum hoc nobis, si mens non laeva fuisset, De caelo tactas memini praedicere quercus*). *Ecl.* ii. 7 (*nil nostri miserere?*). *Ecl.* ii. 44 (*sordent tibi munera nostra*). *Ecl.* iii. 72 (*o quotiens et quae nobis<sup>2</sup> Galatea locuta est!*). *Ecl.* iii. 81 (*triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbres, Arboribus venti, nobis Amaryllidis irae*). *Ecl.* vi. 57 (*Dictaeae Nymphae, nemorum iam claudite saltus, Si qua forte ferant oculis sese obvia nostris Errabunda bovis vestigia*). *Ecl.* ix. 2-6 (*o Lycida, vivi pervenimus, advena nostri (Quod numquam veriti sumus) ut possessor agelli Diceret: 'haec mea sunt; veteres migrate coloni.' Nunc victi, tristes, quoniam fors omnia versat, Hos illi (quod nec vertat bene) mittimus<sup>3</sup> haedos*). *Ecl.* ix. 17 (*heu, tua nobis<sup>4</sup> Paene simul tecum solacia rapta, Menalca?*). *Ecl.* ix. 56 (*causando nostros in longum ducis amores*). *Ecl.* x. 60 (*tamquam haec sit nostri medicina furoris*). *Ecl.* x. 62 (*iam neque Hamadryades rursus neque carmina nobis Ipsa placent*). *Ecl.* x. 64-9 (*non illum nostri possunt mutare labores, Nec si frigoribus mediis Hebrumque bibamus, Sithoniasque nives hiemis subeamus aquosae, Nec si, cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo, Aethiopum versemus oves sub sidere Cancr. Omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus<sup>5</sup> Amori*). *Georg.* iv. 324 (*quo tibi nostri Pulsus amor?*). *Georg.* iv. 448-9 (*deum praecepta secuti Venimus hinc lassis quaesitum oracula rebus*). *Aen.* i. 669 (*nostro doliusti saepe dolore*). *Aen.* ii. 139 (*quos illi fors et poenas ob nostra reposcent Effugia*). *Aen.* ii. 285 (*ut te post multa tuorum Funera, post varios hominumque urbisque labores Defessi aspicimus!*). *Aen.* ii. 595 (*quonam nostri tibi cura recessit?*). *Aen.* ii. 643 (*satis una superque Vidimus excidia et captae superavimus urbi*). *Aen.* ii. 651

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Catullus, vi. 16, lv. 1 and 25, and lxvii. 7 and 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Nobis* confirms Page's contention that this line is a complaint.

<sup>3</sup> If Moeris is Menalcas' servant, these are true plurals. They also belong to (i).

<sup>4</sup> Like *Aen.* vi. 342 perhaps true plural. But

see *Mnemosyne*, loc. cit., p. 155, and cf. Catullus, lxv. 8.

<sup>5</sup> These may be true plurals. Page, in his summary of lines 50-69 and in his note on line 69, shows that he has not made up his mind.

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps true plural.

(*nos*<sup>1</sup> contra *effusi* lacrimis). *Aen.* iii. 325-7 (*nos* patria incensa diversa per aequora vectae Stirpis Achilleae fastus iuvenemque superbum Servitio *enixae tulimus*). *Aen.* iii. 604 (pro quo, si sceleris tanta est iniuria *nostris*, Spargite me in fluctus). *Aen.* iv. 96 (nec me adeo fallit veritam te moenia *nostra*<sup>2</sup> Suspectas habuisse domos Karthaginis altae). *Aen.* iv. 211 and 213 (femina, quae *nostris*<sup>2</sup> errans in finibus urbem Exiguam pretio posuit, cui litus arandum Cuique loci leges *dedimus*, conubia *nostra* Reppulit). *Aen.* iv. 217-18 (*nos* munera templis Quippe tuis *ferimus* famamque *fovemus* inanem). *Aen.* iv. 307 (nec te *noster* amor nec te data dextera quondam Nec moritura tenet crudeli funere Dido?). *Aen.* iv. 369 (num fletu ingemuit *nostro*?). *Aen.* iv. 591 ('pro Iuppiter! ibit Hic', ait 'et *nostris*<sup>2</sup> inluserit advena regnis?'). *Aen.* iv. 623 (cinerique haec mittite *nostro* Munera). *Aen.* iv. 658-60 and 662 ('felix, heu nimium felix, si litora tantum Numquam Dardaniae tetigissent *nostra*<sup>2</sup> carinae'. Dixit, et os impressa toro '*moriemur inultae*, Sed *moriemur*' ait. 'Sic, sic iuvat ire sub umbras. Hauriat hunc oculis ignem crudelis ab alto Dardanus, et *nostrae* secum ferat omina mortis'). *Aen.* v. 742 (quem fugis? aut quis te *nostris* complexibus arcet?). *Aen.* vi. 342 (quis te, Palinure, deorum Eripuit *nobis*?).<sup>3</sup> *Aen.* vi. 465 (siste gradum teque aspectu ne subtrahe *nostro*). *Aen.* vi. 698 (da iungere dextram, Da, genitor, teque amplexu ne subtrahe *nostro*). *Aen.* vii. 293 (heu stirpem invisam et fatis contraria *nostris* Fata Phrygum). *Aen.* viii. 74 (miserantem incommoda *nostra*).<sup>4</sup> *Aen.* viii. 397 (tum quoque fas *nobis* Teucros armare fuisset). *Aen.* viii. 514 (spes et solacia *nostris*). *Aen.* ix. 560 (*nostras*ne evadere, demens, Sperasti te posse manus?). *Aen.* x. 19 (namque aliud quid sit quod iam implorare *queamus*?). *Aen.* x. 42 (*speravimus* ista, Dum fortuna fuit). *Aen.* x. 69 (num linquere castra *Hortati sumus*?). *Aen.* x. 72 (quis deus in fraudem, quae dura potentia *nostris* Egit?). *Aen.* x. 84 (*nos* aliquid Rutulos contra iuvisse nefandum est?). *Aen.* x. 88-9 (*nos*ne tibi fluxas Phrygiae res vertere fundo *Conamur*? *nos*?). *Aen.* x. 880 (nec mortem *horremus* nec divum *parcimus* ulli). *Aen.* xi. 44 ('tene' inquit 'miserande puer, cum laeta veniret, Invidit Fortuna mihi, ne regna videres *Nostra*?'<sup>2</sup>). *Aen.* xi. 113 (rex *nostra*<sup>4</sup> reliquit Hospitia). *Aen.* xi. 166 (sors ista senectae Debita erat *nostrae*). *Aen.* xii. 571 (scilicet expectem libeat dum proelia Turno *Nostra*<sup>4</sup> pati?). *Aen.* xii. 641 (occidit infelix *nostrum* ne dedecus Ufens Aspiceret). *Aen.* xii. 677 (quo deus et quo dura vocat Fortuna *sequamur*).

It is evident that this category represents Virgil's favourite use of the singular *nos*; and in Catullus, too, the corresponding group was found to be by far the largest. The main question, therefore, which readers of this paper will have to decide is whether the evidence of the passages quoted above convinces them of Virgil's tendency to use *nos* for *ego* in passages where the speaker expresses pathos, self-pity, or complaint. If the evidence satisfies him, then *nos*, *nobis*, *nostris*, and the rest will thereafter convey to him an emotional impression of a direct, though perhaps not easily analysable kind, and this study will have achieved its purpose, which is not ultimately linguistic, but aesthetic. The group includes pathos, self-pity, and complaint, and I should prefer that the reader should decide which element of these is predominant in a given instance rather than that I should venture to guide him. There is in fact great intermixture of these elements, and the decision must in many instances be subjective. Pathos, unless it be aroused by another's distress, differs from self-pity only in respect of the circumstances which inspire it and the character of the person who expresses it; and to assess these is frequently a question of individual sympathies. Now *nos* may sometimes be used, as in *Aen.* ii. 139 and 285 and xii. 641, with at least an admixture of pathetic feeling towards others, but its reference is inevitably, in most instances, to the speaker himself. We may feel no doubt that Dido's tragic utterances are truly pathetic, and that the lamentations of amorous

<sup>1</sup> The translators write 'we', but is not *nos* evidently Aeneas?

<sup>2</sup> Also (i).

<sup>3</sup> See p. 131, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps true plural.

rust  
alwa  
the  
of th  
Catu  
a ps  
in tr  
shrin  
own  
by m  
is at  
psyc  
illus  
esta  
are  
orde  
tone  
the  
only  
such  
spec  
we f  
temp  
mise  
xi. 1  
T  
some  
than  
moti  
whic  
Two  
unha  
mak  
tion  
in ii  
assis  
error  
ing.  
idion  
591,  
of a  
love.  
unha  
Anch  
supp  
woun  
men  
sourc  
his d  
B  
sing  
expro

rustics in the *Eclogues* are unworthy to be so described; but the distinction is not always so obvious. When we seek the connexion between self-pity and complaint, the meaning of 'se plaindre' in French makes that sufficiently clear. As for the origin of the idiom, the evidence afforded by Virgil confirms the impression received from Catullus that this usage is cognate to that of the *pluralis modestiae*, to which it affords a psychological parallel. Of the usage in Catullus I wrote as follows: 'I think we are in truth much nearer to the old-fashioned *pluralis modestiae*, in which the personality shrinks back into the crowd in order to avoid undue prominence. The spectacle of my own grief, or the sense of my own wrongs, causes me to seek an illusion of sympathy by merging myself in a larger unit and thus escaping from my own personality, which is at the moment depressing company. In the case of grief pure and simple, such a psychological proceeding gives an illusion of sympathy, in the case of complaint an illusion of justification. But, whatever the origin of such a usage, when once it is established its employment is no doubt instinctive and almost unconscious.' There are perhaps also instances in which pathos is affected in an ingratiating manner in order to secure sympathy (see *Georg.* iv. 448-9, and *Aen.* ii. 139 and iii. 604), and the tone is not far removed from that of the *pluralis modestiae*. Once again I would remind the reader that in the contexts of this category, as elsewhere, the singular *nos* not only is not essential, but is less common than *ego*. But it is so much more common in such contexts than in the text as a whole that we must consider it to possess a meaning specially suited to them. Finally, in this category, as in that of the *pluralis modestiae*, we find *nos* in contrast to a word designating another person. The spectacle or contemplation of another's happiness or prosperity enhances the pathos of one's own misery or distress. Such examples are *Aen.* iii. 325-7 and x. 84. In *Aen.* x. 88-90 and xi. 166 there is a similar contrast, but from different motives.

The grounds for pathos, self-pity, or complaint, though many and various, show some tendency to fall into groups, a tendency more marked in the case of pathos than in that of complaint, whose motives are less limited and predictable. These motives, like the categories themselves, dovetail and overlap; we find instances in which several could be postulated, and more than one may be considered as operative. Two types of context in which the pathetic *nos* is conspicuous are those relating to unhappiness in love and to the prospect of death; the combination of these motives makes for great poignancy when the speaker is Dido. As for unhappiness and frustration in love, we have in the *Eclogues* the somewhat trivial lamentations of Corydon in ii. 7, and of Gallus in x. 60-9. In iii. 72 (see note 2, p. 131) the self-pitying *nobis* assists us to decide in favour of a correct interpretation of the passage as against an erroneous one. In vi. 57 the speaker is Pasiphaë, an unfortunate lover on any reckoning, and twice called by the poet 'virgo infelix'. But the highest possibilities of the idiom in this connexion are realized only in the speeches of Dido in *Aen.* iv. 307, 369, 591, 623, and 658-62, in the first and in the latter two of which passages the prospect of a cruel and untimely death crowns the tragedy of her frustration and betrayal in love. See also lines 612 and 625, quoted in category (v). This prospect of death in unhappy circumstances, joined to the memory of past sufferings, is the motive for Anchises' pathos in ii. 643, and that of Mezentius in x. 880, where the plural strongly supports Henry's pathetic interpretation of the passage. Mezentius, old, weak, and wounded, knows that he is about to perish (lines 855-6 and 881); he is friendless among men and cared for by no god (lines 853 and 880), and he has lost his son, his only source of happiness. Turnus too, in xii. 677, uses the plural when he decides to meet his death (see lines 678-9).

Bereavement is another pathetic circumstance which promotes the use of the singular *nos*. *Ecl.* ix. 17 and *Aen.* vi. 342 (see note 4, p. 131) are similar in spirit and expression. In *Aen.* xi. 44 the plural is used by Aeneas, and in xi. 166 by Evander,

in pathetic reference to the death of Pallas, while in viii. 514 Evander uses it in reference to his still living son as the solace of his widowed old age ('quia amissa coniuge unici filii utebatur solacio', Servius).

Somewhat akin to the use in connexion with bereavement is an interesting series in which the pathetic plural is used in addressing a phantom of some dear departed one. Such are *Aen.* ii. 285 (Aeneas to the ghost of Hector), v. 742 (Aeneas to the ghost of Anchises), vi. 465 and 698 (Aeneas to Dido and Anchises in the Underworld). The parallelism of expression between the last three passages is remarkable, suggesting a half-conscious recollection by the poet of a turn of expression which had particularly pleased him; and the pathetic *noster* is, as it were, the greatest common measure of all three.

In *Aen.* ii. 285 and 643, and in viii. 74, the thought of trials suffered is allied to other motives for pathos, and the reader will doubtless notice other similar examples in the various groups of this category, in which such a consideration exists as an alternative or subordinate motive. In *Aen.* iii. 325-7 Andromache's humiliation as the slave and plaything of Neoptolemus is splendidly brought out in a majestic series of pathetic plurals. There is also a number of passages in which material ruin or distress is the motive for a pathos which tends to degenerate into self-pity. Such are *Ecl.* i. 16 and ix. 2-6, and *Georg.* iv. 448-9. Finally, it is of interest to note that in some instances the speaker is one who represents himself as a victim of fortune or fate (see *Aen.* vii. 293, x. 42, xi. 44, xi. 166, and xii. 677).

But to return to sentimental grounds for pathos, we find *nos* where the speaker envisages himself as the object of another's emotion. Of this kind are *Ecl.* ii. 7 and *Aen.* viii. 74, where the emotion is pity; in *Georg.* iv. 324 and *Aen.* ii. 595 it is love. In three of these instances the pathetic effect is increased by the apparent denial of the pity or love desired, and the tone is that of a complaint. Akin to these are the instances in which the speaker is the object of an unfriendly emotion, such as scorn or anger. In *Ecl.* iii. 81 it is anger, and in *Ecl.* ii. 44 and in *Aen.* iv. 211, 213, and 591 scorn or contempt. The mention of one's own grief or tears evokes the pathetic *nos* in *Aen.* i. 669, ii. 651, and iv. 369.

A natural use of the singular *nos* is in the complaints of mortals to the deities who are responsible for their welfare, but who seem to neglect them. Such are *Georg.* iv. 324 and *Aen.* iv. 217-18.

The one group remaining is that in which a discontented or thwarted deity is the speaker, and here the usage gravitates towards ill-tempered and childish complaint; which is quite in harmony with the epic conception of divinity. All the passages occur in the *Aeneid*, and in every case the speaker is either Venus or Juno, one of the two goddesses whose contending wills arouse and maintain the mortal contest. The singular *nos* on the lips of *alma Venus* is gracious in tone and not devoid of true pathos; she is a creature of charm, and also a mother genuinely concerned for the welfare of her son and of his people. To Juno, a jealous and wilful termagant, the fate of the mortals whom she champions is a matter of less serious concern than the annoyance of being frustrated in her designs, and graciousness is a quality she has no desire to affect. Hence her utterances tend to express self-pitying and ill-natured complaint. In i. 669 Venus, addressing Cupid, speaks of her grief for Aeneas' hardships; and in x. 19 and 42, addressing Jupiter at the heavenly council, though she is not devoid of personal annoyance at the frustration of her purpose, she is also concerned for her mortal dependants, and it is in her nature to affect a winsome pathos rather than to scold and complain. Not so Juno, who in her reply uses *nos* (x. 69, 72, 84, 88-9) in a tone of ill-natured complaint which, in lines 88-9, rises to a climax of screaming fury; and her sentiment throughout is the selfish annoyance of a thwarted female. In iv. 96, where she addresses Venus, her complaint appears somewhat less



selfish; but her whole speech is a pretence (see lines 105-6). In vii. 293 her ignoble self-pity shows itself to perfection. See also vii. 332.

A few scattered instances remain of the kind in which *nos* expresses a complaint rather than pathos. *Ecl.* ix. 56 is the only instance of thoroughly good-natured complaint. In *Aen.* viii. 397 the complaining tone of *nobis* is delicately appropriate to the situation of Vulcan and his treatment by Venus. After her unfaithfulness and her neglect of him, she now approaches him only when she needs his help for her son by another father. The compliment, such as it was, of asking for such services had during the Trojan War been left to a stranger, Thetis, to pay, when it should have come from his own wife. Naturally, then, he is described in line 388 as *cunctantem*, and Venus' blandishments have not so far obliterated his sense of injury as to preclude a gentle reproach. In ix. 560 Turnus, with vicious contumely, complains of a poor victim's presumption in hoping that he could escape. Aeneas complains in xi. 113 of Latinus' desertion of his alliance, and in xii. 571 of Turnus' refusal to meet him in battle.

## APPENDIX

It will have been noticed that several of the examples dealt with in this paper could be considered as true plurals, but have been discussed as examples of the singular *nos* because there were reasonable grounds for regarding them as singular, if a reader so decided. The following instances, several of which, if taken as examples of the singular *nos*, would confirm the views expressed above, have been omitted because careful consideration convinced me that they were true plurals: *Ecl.* i. 3-4 (see lines 64 ff.). *Ecl.* vii. 70 (*nobis* = πομπή in Theocritus viii. 92). *Ecl.* ix. 12 (the *carmina* were written by Menalcas, not by the speaker, Moeris). *Aen.* iv. 316 (*conubia nostra* = 'our marriage', unlike line 213 and Catullus lxiv. 158. See also *Aen.* xii. 42). *Aen.* v. 417 (*nostra* = 'owned by my master Eryx and me'). *Aen.* vi. 187 (*nobis* = Aeneas and the other searchers). *Aen.* vii. 68 (*cernimus* = 'what we behold portends . . .'). *Aen.* vii. 271 ('qui sanguine nostrum Nomen in astra ferant'). The speaker is Latinus, but he is quoting the oracle of vii. 98, where his father, Faunus, is the speaker, and *nostrum nomen* = *nostri generis nomen*). *Aen.* viii. 37 (line 38 shows that Tiberinus is referring to Latium as a whole). *Aen.* xi. 282-3 (the subject of *stetimus* and *contulimus* is 'Aeneas and I'). *Aen.* xi. 334 (see Page's clear and instructive note). *Aen.* xi. 536 (when Diana speaks to Opis of *nostris* armis, she means 'our arms', for Opis herself in line 844 speaks to Camilla of the same weapons as *nostras* . . . sagittas).

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD.



## SOME EMENDATIONS IN LATE LATIN TEXTS

Avianus, *Fabulae* 40. 2.

Distinctus maculis et pulchro pectore pardus  
Inter consimiles ibat *inira* feras.

For the senseless *inira* some manuscripts have *inire* or *in arva*, and the latter stands in the text of Baehrens (*Poetae Latini Minores*, v, 1883, p. 67). The attempts at emendation may be divided into two groups, those altering only *inira* and those tampering with *ibat* as well. I pass over the latter group, as Robinson Ellis, in his commentary, p. 125, has defended *ibat* sufficiently by reference to the frequent *īei* in Babrius, Avianus' model. The former group is represented by Withof (*ibat honore*) and Robinson Ellis himself (*ibat in ora*); and the editors of the Loeb text of the Minor Latin Poets, in 1934, had the verse printed with this *in ora*. Nobody seems to have seen that the verse-maker had to express the idea of the panther's pride. Therefore I propose *ibat in* <as>*tra*, a metaphorical phrase for the animal's conceit. For this metaphor cf. Horace's famous *feriam sidera*, for *ibat* Virg. Aen. 9. 641 *sic itur ad astra*, for *in astra* at the same place of the pentameter after a verb of motion Prop. 3. 18, 34 *cessit in astra*; Ov. *Fast.* 2. 478 and 3. 186 *venit in astra*. Avianus himself has this *in astra* before the last word of the pentameter in two more passages, 15. 8, 19. 6.

There is another observation to support my emendation. Our versifier likes to fasten with cramp-irons, so to speak, two consecutive fables by the use of the same word in both of them. I list the following instances, taken from Ellis's useful *Index Verborum*: *audax* 17. 3 and 18. 9 (only in one other place *audaci*); *iram* 36. 7 and 37. 13 (only in two places besides: *iram* and *ira* respectively); *otia* 36. 4 (and 16) and 37. 5 (only once besides); *pericula* only 25. 11 and 26. 9; *rursum* only in 20 and 21; forms of the noun *tempus* only in 33 and 34. Now *astra* occurs in 39 (v. 12) and so makes the restoration of the same word in 40 the more probable.

In the same volume v of his *P.L.M.* which contains Avianus Baehrens edited the so-called *Aegritudo Perdicae*, an epyllion in 290 hexameters. This was re-edited in 1914 by Fr. Vollmer in his *P.L.M.* v. 238-50. Quite recently Mr. A. Hudson-Williams, writing in *C.Q.* xxxiii, 1939, 162, has defended two passages of this remarkable poem against the alterations of its editors, but there remain scores of doubtful lines in a work poorly transmitted by only one late manuscript, the Harleianus 3685. In a few cases I hope to improve on the readings in our texts.

In 117-29 there is a monologue of the unhappy prince Perdicas, from which I must quote four lines.

122 et matri narrabo? nefas! tamen ibo coactus:  
124 credamus! quibus hoc poteris componere verbis  
125 aut vox qualis erit? adgressus namque parentem  
123 'mater, ave' dicturus ero. quid deinde? tacebo.

The transposition of 123 to follow 125 is necessary, as Erwin Rohde<sup>1</sup> saw, and A. Riese's *quibus* for *quid* in 124 is unavoidable too. *Credamus* in 124 would be a self-exhortation of the lover to confide his secret to his mother. But the plural number between the singulars *ibo* in 122 and *poteris* in 124 is awkward, and the same is of course true of Rohde's *cedamus*, which Vollmer adopted for his text. Moreover, we have no word to which to refer *hoc*; and lastly, the new scruple of Perdicas should be introduced naturally by a *sed*. This I see in the *cred* of *credamus*, and the remaining

<sup>1</sup> He was Baehrens's colleague at Jena University in 1876-7 and so contributed suggestions to his first edition (1877) of the poem.

*amus* provides us with the necessary noun as an object to *componere*. Accordingly I read:

sed facinus quibus hoc poteris componere verbis  
aut vox qualis erit?

Perdicas' incestuous love for his own mother is of course a *facinus*.

138 ff. famulasque vocavit  
ad sese iussitque artis medicinae requiri  
primores qui forte forent adducere secum.

Baehrens wrote *artis circum medicinae*, a very bad conjecture, since the poet does not allow himself a word of four syllables at the end of the line. Vollmer, who does not mention this infelicitous attempt in his apparatus, writes: *medicinae* certe glossa est, conieci quale *decora alta requiri et*. This is even more perverse, for the poet wished merely to say that the queen summoned the masters of the medical art. So a form of *medicina* is indeed required, and as syntax and metre show, it can only be the vocative. I suggest *artis, medicina, tuai*, an emendation which needs a word of explanation. Our poet is fond of the stylistic figure called apostrophe. According to Vollmer's *Index Nominum* s.v. 'Perdicas' he apostrophizes his hero no less than five times; and in 155 Hippocrates, in a monologue, says: *Quid, medicina, taces?* So the supposition of an apostrophe in 139 seems justified. As to the archaic genitive *tuai*, every poet who wrote hexameters might feel entitled to use such forms. There is a late example of it in Prudentius, *Apoth.* 702 *medicae purgamen aquai*.

As for the palaeographical side of my emendation, *tuai* could easily be misread to *tuiri*, and subsequently an infinitive in *-uiri* was made out of this. The corruption of a form in *-ai* is by no means isolated—on the contrary such forms have often to be restored by critics after having been obliterated in the transmission of the texts.

222 f. Castalia orders  
matronas omnes totis e moenibus urbis  
ad propriam venire (*sic*) domum, si quis vigor illic  
aut species inlustris erat vel forma superba.

Rohde corrected *illic* to *illex*, and both editors followed him. I object that the poet likes the word *illic*, cf. 146, 152, and that it gives good sense if we take *quis* as *quibus* (ἐῖ τῶν). It means 'in the town', and *inlustris* may be taken ἀπὸ κοινῶν with *vigor* and *species*.

232 f. huc etiam tenerae sanctae venere puellae  
virgineum florem servantem lege maritis.

The two epithets of *puellae* are as odd as is *lege* without epithet in the next line. Read *sancta*. In accordance with the sacred law of marriage they preserve their virginity for their husbands. Horace (*Sat.* ii, 1, 81) has *sanctarum legum*.

*Anth. Lat.* 21. 205. In this charming *declamatio* there is a tirade against that fateful metal, gold:

hoc Medea maga est, serpens vigil, exul Iason,  
hoc Mida ieiunus, Paris ultus, † naufragus Helles,  
hoc sapiens Furia, Venus invida, Iuno cruenta. . . .

For *sapiens* M. Haupt read *Pallas*, adding an *est* to follow *Furia*. A note by Riese intimates that this insertion is metrically superfluous. Haupt must have believed that *sapiens* supplanted *Pallas* by intentional interpolation, but I have a less unlikely remedy for the hemistich: Hoc sapiens <dea> fur, Venus. . . . As *sapientiae* is an awkward word-form in a hexameter, the poet, instead of *dea sapientiae*, said *sapiens dea*, just as Cicero, *pro Mil.* 3. 8 has *sapientissimae deae* for Minerva. For *fur* = female thief, cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 1237 *fures estis ambae*. As to mythology, the goddess

accompanied Hercules when he stole the Delphic tripod and therefore might be called a thief when this suited a late poet's rhetoric.

*Anth. Lat.* 494 b (*Laus Herculis*) V. 3.

Pierium columnen, cuius Parnasia magno  
numine templa sonant, Phoebe, precor, huc age, laeto  
tecum cuncta choro!

I have omitted the comma which Riese has after *laeto*, because this word belongs to *choro*, and I have put a note of exclamation after this *choro* instead of the editor's semicolon. In punctuation he is especially weak: for instance in 4. 75 where the colon in Baehrens's edition (*P.L.M.* iii, p. 290) is better than Riese's full stop which leaves *iussit* (74) without an object. In these initial lines of the *Laus Herculis* scholars have disliked the lengthening of the -e of *Phoebe*, and Camersius proposed *laeto precor huc age Phoebe*. Riese put an obelus before *cuncta*, while Birt, in his edition of Claudian, connected *age . . . cuncta*. But it seems nonsense that the god should be asked to bring *cuncta*. So Claverius wrote *iunge* for *cuncta*, and Jeep *laetos | tecum iunge choros*, giving a sense to *tecum*. This, however, is arbitrary, and I think another course would be safer. Not *cuncta* but *tecum* is corrupt. The meaning of the passage seems to be: fill everything with thy glad choir! Hence I read *comple* for *tecum*. The textual critic must reckon sometimes with the transposition of syllables as a source of corruption; so *comple* might become *plecom* and subsequently *tecum*. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 5. 107 *laeto complebant litora coetu*; Cic. *Rep.* 6. 17 *cuncta . . . compleat*; Liv. 2. 17. 2 *cuncta complent*, 5. 37. 8 *cuncta compleverat*; Sil. Ital. 5. 32 *cuncta tumultu implere*.

*Anth. Lat.* 723. 9, in a hymn to Luna:

Isis, Luna, Choris, Caelestis Iuno, Cybebe!

On the third word Riese remarks: *Ceres* Buecheler et Haupt, fort. recte *Core* Loewe. These critics seem to have supposed that all the names in the line are vocatives. I feel sure that only *Luna* is one and, with a slight alteration, read *cluis* for *Choris*: Thou, O Luna, art called Isis, Iuno Caelestis, and Cybebe. I compare Mart. Cap. 6. 571 *tuque ignis flos es cluis et glaucopis Athene*.

LONDON.

W. MOREL.

THE C  
defied  
the d  
the c  
alloca  
and t  
Stran  
Polyn  
(551-  
compi  
with  
assum  
These  
from  
again  
paper  
faults  
A  
editio  
of Gr  
adapt  
be ac  
this  
opini  
mow  
men  
below

I.

<sup>1</sup> O  
of Ae  
<sup>2</sup> T  
of the  
by th  
mute,  
<sup>3</sup> T  
accep  
So-Ca  
Greek  
below  
<sup>4</sup> A  
<sup>5</sup> G  
1841,  
trans  
<sup>6</sup> P

## THE DIVISION OF PARTS AMONG THE ACTORS IN SOPHOCLES' *OEDIPUS COLONEUS*

THE distribution of the parts among the actors in the *O.C.* is a problem that has long defied solution. In all the other extant plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides the dramatis personae can without difficulty be divided between three<sup>1</sup> actors: but the construction of the *O.C.* is so complex that it does not admit any such simple allocation. When the part of Oedipus (1-1555) has been assigned to the first actor, and that of Antigone (1-847, 1099-555, 1670-end) to the second, the roles of the Stranger (36-80), Ismene (324-509, 1099-555 mute, 1670-end), Creon (728-1043), and Polyneices (1254-446) must clearly belong to the third: who, then, is to play Theseus (551-667, 887-1043, 1099-210, 1500-55, 1751-end)? It seems impossible to allot the part *complete* to any one of the three actors. Faced by this crux, all those who have dealt with the subject have chosen one or the other of two clear-cut alternatives, either the assumption of a fourth regular<sup>2</sup> actor, or else the splitting-up of the single part of Theseus between two or three actors. These two alternatives, both of which are far from satisfactory—the former infringing the three-actor rule,<sup>3</sup> the latter offending against scenic probability and realism—are fully examined below; at the end of the paper a new part-distribution is suggested, which, it is hoped, avoids both these faults.

A fourth regular actor was first postulated for the *O.C.* by K. O. Müller in 1833 in his edition of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*<sup>4</sup>—a proposal he developed more fully in his *History of Greek Literature*,<sup>5</sup> where he wrote: 'All the plays of Sophocles and Euripides are adapted for three actors only, excepting one, the *Oedipus in Colonus*, which could not be acted without the admission of a fourth. The rich and intricate composition of this noble drama would have been impossible without this innovation.' Similar opinions have been held by several other writers,<sup>6</sup> not least among whom was Wilamowitz.<sup>7</sup> Müller did not go to the extent of illustrating his statement by a specimen part-distribution, but four such casts, suggested by other writers, are given below:

### I. Jebb.<sup>8</sup>

1. Oedipus (1-1555).
2. Antigone (1-847, 1099-555, 1670-end).
3. Ismene (324-509, 1099-555, 1670-end).
- Creon (728-1043).

<sup>1</sup> Or between two only in the earlier tragedies of Aeschylus.

<sup>2</sup> The word 'regular' is used to signify an actor of the same standing as the three actors granted by the State, as distinct from a supernumerary, mute, etc.

<sup>3</sup> The validity of the three-actor rule is here accepted, although the arguments of Rees, *The So-Called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama*, Chicago, 1908, are considered below.

<sup>4</sup> *Aesch. Eumeniden*, 1833, p. 172, n. 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, 1st ed. 1841, ii, p. 55; 4th ed. 1882, i, p. 510; English trans., 1840, p. 305; 1858, i, p. 403.

<sup>6</sup> K. F. R. Schultze, *De chori Graecorum tragici*

*habitu externo*, 1856, p. 60; A. Müller, *Lehrbuch der griechischen Bühnenalterthümer*, 1886, p. 175; *Das attische Bühnenwesen*, 1902, p. 68; G. Norwood, *Greek Tragedy*, 1920, p. 167, n. 4; R. Völpel, 'Zum Schauspielerproblem', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, lxxvi, 1927, p. 16; A. Willem, *Melpomène*, 1932, p. 149; A. Lesky, *Die griechische Tragödie*, 1938, p. 125.

<sup>7</sup> *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, by Tycho von Wilamowitz (Philologische Untersuchungen, 22, Berlin, 1917), chapter vii, 'Oed. Col.' by Ulrich von Wil., p. 333 text and n. 1; *Griechische Tragödien übersetzt von Ulrich von Wil.*, xiv, *Die griechische Tragödie und ihre drei Dichter*, 1923, p. 128 n.

<sup>8</sup> *Oedipus Coloneus*, 3rd ed. 1900, p. 7.

4. Stranger (36-80).  
Theseus (551-667, 887-1043, 1099-210, 1500-55, 1751-end).  
Polyneices (1254-446).  
Messenger<sup>1</sup> (1579-669).

The fourth actor's part is here rather overloaded in comparison with that of the others.

## II. Croiset.<sup>2</sup>

1. Oedipus.
2. Antigone.
3. Stranger, Ismene (except 1099-555), Creon, Polyneices, Messenger.<sup>1</sup>
4. Theseus.

(Mute. Ismene 1099-555.)

The allocation of Theseus to the fourth actor as his only role avoids the frequent mask-changing expected of this actor in Jebb's cast, and is in keeping with the importance of Theseus in the drama; but the circumstance that Polyneices is on the stage from 1254 to 1446 requires that Ismene from 1099 to 1555 be played by a mute—a resort in itself perfectly justifiable, but far less probable when a fourth actor has already been assumed, in excess of the usual number.

## III. J. Richter.<sup>3</sup>

1. Oedipus.
2. Antigone.
3. Ismene (except 1099-555), Creon, Polyneices.
4. Stranger, Theseus, Messenger.

(Mute. Ismene 1099-555.)

Richter, too, in exactly the same way failed to realize that in addition to his fourth actor a mute was needed for Ismene from 1099 to 1555, as Ascherson<sup>4</sup> pointed out: 'Er braucht aber hiebei für die Ismene von wenigstens v. 1249-1446, wo sie mit dem Polyneikes zusammen auftritt, noch ein *κωφόν πρόσωπον*.' The arrangements of both Croiset and Richter must be considered improbable for this reason.

## IV. Lachmann.<sup>5</sup>

1. Oedipus, Messenger.
2. Antigone.
3. Theseus, Polyneices.
4. Stranger, Ismene, Creon.

This is perhaps the most suitable and simplest distribution for four actors; no mute is necessitated, and the parts are more evenly divided between the four than in Jebb's cast.

<sup>1</sup> The Messenger's part may equally well be here allotted to the first actor.

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire de la Littérature grecque*, iii (3rd ed. 1913), p. 258, n. 1. An almost identical distribution was hinted at by Th. Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, iii (1884), p. 84.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Vertheilung der Rollen unter die Schauspieler der griechischen Tragödie*, Berlin, 1842, pp. 51-2.

<sup>4</sup> 'Ueber die Rollenvertheilung im Oedipus auf Kolonos des Sophokles', *Philologus*, xii, 1857 (pp. 750-4), p. 752. Richter in his distribution gave the parts of the Stranger, Theseus, and the Messenger to a *παραχρήγημα* or supernumerary; but a *παρ.* (discussed more fully below) could undertake only *short* extra parts, and Richter was really postulating a fourth regular actor;

cf. Ascherson (p. 752), 'Wenn Richter den Polyneikes dem *παραχρήγημα* . . . gegeben hätte, so hätte er mit vier Personen auskommen können'.

<sup>5</sup> *De Mensura Tragoediarum*, Berlin, 1822, p. 45. Like Richter (cf. n. 4), Lachmann incorrectly assigned to a *παραχρήγημα* roles of such length (in this case those of the Stranger, Ismene, and Creon) that they could be played only by a fourth regular actor (although both scholars had in fact intended to give merely three-actor distributions). Ascherson (pp. 751-2) notes that in Lachmann's arrangement either the Stranger or the Messenger or both may belong to the third actor: if both, the cast becomes identical with Jebb's.



# DIVISION OF PARTS IN SOPHOCLES' *OEDIPUS COLONEUS* 141

The objections to the four-actor theory in the *O.C.* are so numerous that it is not surprising that even the above advocates of it showed little confidence in their suggestions. Both Jebb and Croiset produced their distributions merely *exempli gratia*: even Müller (loc. cit.) admitted that 'Sophocles himself does not appear to have dared to introduce it [the innovation of a fourth actor] on the stage. It is known that the *Oedipus in Colonus* was not acted till after his death, when it was brought out by Sophocles the younger'. It is, however, irrelevant to speculate upon the methods employed in the play's production after the poet's death: the only important consideration is, 'How did Sophocles himself intend the parts to be allocated, and among how many actors?' In answer to the latter question, Müller, it seems (to judge from his own words), would hardly have ventured to maintain that four were required.

The chief objection to the assumption of a fourth actor is, of course, the three-actor rule, to which there is no proved exception.<sup>1</sup> To escape this difficulty it has been suggested in reply that just as Aeschylus first employed a third actor in his last dramas, so Sophocles may have adopted a fourth actor at the extreme end of his life.<sup>2</sup> Quite apart from the lack of evidence in its support, the whole argument depends on the supposition that the *O.C.* was composed at the very end of Sophocles' life. Gottfried Hermann<sup>3</sup> questioned this; and the possibility (which can never be ignored)<sup>4</sup> that the *O.C.* was composed before the *Philoctetes* (409), although not acted until 401, deprives the theory of much of its force.

Scholars of the last century who postulated four actors for the *O.C.* regarded this tragedy as the sole exception to the three-actor rule, to which they adhered for all other dramas. But Rees, in his important work, *The So-Called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama*, sought to expose the rule as fallacious and to show that the tragic poets did not concern themselves with the exigencies of part-distribution either in the course of their composition or subsequently, since (so he held) they had as many actors at their disposal as they desired. The three-actor rule he conceived to have been a mistaken deduction from the practice of post-classical actor-guilds (τεχνίται), who, receiving no State subsidy, were compelled to present their plays with the minimum possible number of actors, which happened in all cases to be three. A careful examination of the facts, however, tends to discredit Rees's hypothesis. There is admittedly little positive evidence with which to rebut it except the general opinion among the ancients that a fourth actor was avoided, e.g. 'nec quarta loqui persona laboret' (Hor. *A.P.* 192), μετεσκεύασται ὁ ἐξάγγελος εἰς Πυλάδην, ἵνα μὴ δ' ἰλέωσιν (Schol. ad Aesch. *Cho.* 899): but the negative evidence is extremely abundant and may be considered decisive against it. If Sophocles (and the other tragedians) employed more than three actors, why was this not also mentioned by the ancient writers who repeatedly state merely that he introduced a third (τρεῖς δὲ καὶ σκηνογραφίαν Σοφοκλῆς Arist. *Poetics*, 1449<sup>a</sup>13; τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σοφοκλῆς Diog. Laert. iii. 56; καὶ τὸν τρίτον ὑποκριτὴν ἐξεῦρεν Vita Soph. §4 ad fin.; οὗτος πρῶτος τρισὶν ἐχρήσατο

<sup>1</sup> The *Rhesus*, far from needing four actors, can without difficulty be played by three and was possibly intended for only two (cf. Paley, *Euripides*, i, p. 9).

<sup>2</sup> K. O. Müller, *Aesch. Eum.*, p. 172, n. 9, 'Es ist merkwürdig, dass, wie Aeschylus erst in seiner letzten Trilogie, der *Orestea*, drei Schauspieler zuließ, so wiederum Sophokles erst am Ende seiner Laufbahn, in dem *Oedipus auf Kolonos*, einen vierten hinzugenommen hat'; cf. Prof. H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature*, 1934, p. 171, 'the fact that it needs a fourth actor fits very well with the tradition that it is the

work of Sophokles' old age'.

<sup>3</sup> J. G. Hermann, *Sophocles*, vol. ii, 1827, pp. cclxxxii-cclxxxvi.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. H. Siess, 'Chronologische Untersuchungen zu den Tragödien des Sophokles', *Wiener Studien*, xxxvi (1914), pp. 244-94, xxxvii (1915), pp. 27-62: after a thorough examination of many aspects of Sophocles' style she concludes (p. 62), 'der *O.C.* hingegen etwas älter als *Phil.*': Jebb, *Soph. EL.*, p. lvii, n. 2, 'The extraordinarily high proportion in the *Philoctetes* (409 B.C.) must be considered as indicative of the poet's latest period'.

ὑποκριταῖς Suidas, s.v. Σοφ.), and why are there no special names for the actors used in addition to the πρωταγωνιστής, δευτεραγωνιστής, and τριταγωνιστής?<sup>1</sup> It must be conceded that these arguments are not conclusive, being drawn for the most part from the very writers whom Rees considered to have been responsible for assigning to classical drama (in their references to it) the dramatic methods of their own day. The only testimony of certain value is that of the tragedies themselves. It has been pointed out by Kaffenberger<sup>2</sup> and Flickinger<sup>3</sup> (both of whom reject Rees's results) that two factors in the extant plays, (1) the silences of characters, and (2) the motivation and construction of entrances and exits, although admittedly *argumenta e silentio*, provide convincing proof not only that the tragedians could use no more than three actors, but also that in the composition of their plays they were compelled to keep this consideration in mind continually. In many cases the awkward silence of a character at a time when he might be expected to speak can be explained only by the fact that the three actors are already on the stage playing other parts.<sup>4</sup> Much more frequently still, a character is made to leave the stage for such obviously unsatisfactory reasons that it can only be concluded that the poet required the actor for some other part. An attempt has been made recently by Schlesinger<sup>5</sup> to defend Rees's hypothesis by showing these awkward silences and apparently purposeless exits to be due, not to the restrictions of the three-actor rule, but to hitherto unnoticed sub-plots or special dramatic reasons. His explanations are imaginative, but not convincing.

Rees (p. 78) proposed a six-actor distribution for the *O.C.* as follows:

1. Oedipus.
2. Theseus.
3. Antigone.
4. Ismene.
5. Creon, Messenger.
6. Polyneices, Stranger.

This cast has nothing to commend it, even if it were admissible, since once the limit of three actors has been exceeded, there appears no valid reason why a separate actor should not be allotted to each single character. In addition, Flickinger (p. 182) stresses that in such an arrangement there is 'no explanation for the complicated system of entrances and exits and for the strange silence of Ismene during vss. 1099-1555, especially during vss. 1457-99'. To account for Ismene's silence, Rees himself invoked a so-called 'aesthetic law'<sup>6</sup> that a fourth character may not speak if three others are conversing (p. 41), and went on to state (p. 48), 'The silence of Ismene is to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. Guglielmino, *Arte e Artificio nel Dramma Greco*, Catania, 1912, p. 87, n. 1. The technical names for the three actors have been avoided in this paper. See, however, O. J. Todd, 'ΤΡΙΤΑΓΩΝΙΣΤΗΣ: a Reconsideration', *C.Q.* xxxii (1938), pp. 30-8, where Rees's conclusions are criticized.

<sup>2</sup> H. Kaffenberger, *Das Dreischauspielergesetz in der griechischen Tragödie*, Diss. Darmstadt, 1911; a criticism of this work by C. Fensterbusch is to be found in *Bursians Jahresbericht der Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. ccliii (1936), pp. 38-41.

<sup>3</sup> R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, Chicago, 4th ed. 1936, chap. iii.

<sup>4</sup> J. T. Allen, *Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and Romans and their Influence*, 1927, p. 136: 'The occasional awkward silence of a fourth

person who though addressed does not reply, as Pylades in the *Orestes* of Euripides (vss. 1591 ff.), who says not a word in spite of the ardent appeal of Menelaus, is difficult to explain on any other supposition than that for some reason the poet had only three actors at his disposal': cf. Haigh, *Attic Theatre* (3rd ed. 1907), p. 236.

<sup>5</sup> A. C. Schlesinger, 'Silence in Tragedy and the Three-Actor Rule', *Proceedings of Am. Phil. Assoc.* lx (1929), p. xxvi, *Classical Philology*, xxv (1930), pp. 230-5; 'The Ins and Outs of the Three-Actor Rule', *Classical Philology*, xxviii (1933), pp. 176-81.

<sup>6</sup> This aesthetic law had already been assumed by J. Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

be att  
three  
to the  
Ismer  
this p  
Ismer  
easily  
when  
the p  
causes  
adduc  
view,  
in the  
the el  
a sup  
ately  
The  
part-c  
rule.  
traged  
times  
Never  
insup  
Oedip  
1670-  
1099-  
the pa  
His ro  
(where  
in the  
have t  
mann,

Mu  
Th  
others  
three  
to sce  
Antig

<sup>1</sup> A  
skill.

<sup>2</sup> p.  
singer,

<sup>3</sup> Att  
other s  
only th  
Stählin,  
teratur,  
Antico  
mino, F

# DIVISION OF PARTS IN SOPHOCLES' OEDIPUS COLONEUS 143

be attributed to the poet's unwillingness or inability<sup>1</sup> to employ effectively more than three persons at once'. But Flickinger<sup>2</sup> refuted the 'aesthetic law' by drawing attention to the fact that 'during vss. 1447-99 Oedipus and his two daughters are left alone, and Ismene still remains silent. Consequently the aesthetic explanation breaks down at this point and we must stand by our earlier conclusion that throughout these scenes Ismene is impersonated by a mute.' The complex series of entrances and exits is easily comprehensible when the needs of a three-actor distribution are borne in mind: when more actors are assumed it becomes inexplicable. Rees avoided all mention of the point: Schlesinger (*Ins and Outs*, p. 177) suggests dramatic and other special causes as alternative reasons for the entrances and exits, but the arguments he adduces are inadequate and somewhat far-fetched. For example, Sophocles, in his view, made Ismene depart at 509 'because, while she must be included with Antigone in the seizure, to have both girls overpowered on stage would be to overemphasize the element of rough-house in the capture, thus threatening the dignity of the play'—a super-subtle and quite invalid distinction, since the violence of the scene is deliberately emphasized in order to stress the extent of Creon's insolence.

The assumption of four or more actors is accordingly seen to be no solution of the part-distribution in the *O.C.*; the answer is to be found somewhere in the three-actor rule. As was stated by Haigh,<sup>3</sup> the number of three actors 'was never exceeded . . . in tragedy. All the extant Greek plays could be performed by three actors. It is sometimes said that the Oedipus Coloneus . . . requires four actors; but this is not the case.' Nevertheless, all the three-actor casts that have so far been proposed contain almost insuperable difficulties resulting from the impasse already mentioned—namely, when Oedipus (1-1555) has been allotted to the first actor, Antigone (1-847, 1099-555, 1670-end) to the second, and consequently the Stranger (36-80), Ismene (324-509, 1099-555 mute, 1670-end), Creon (728-1043), and Polyneices (1254-446) to the third, the part of Theseus (551-667, 887-1043, 1099-210, 1500-55, 1751-end) must be split up. His role in three of the scenes may be given to the third actor, but his lines 887-1043 (where the third actor is required as Creon) have to be fitted into the convenient gap in the second actor's role, and 1751-end (where the third actor is required as Ismene) have to be assigned to the first actor. Such a cast was first proposed by K. F. Hermann,<sup>4</sup> the actors' roles being as follows:

1. Oedipus (1-1555), Messenger (1579-669), Theseus (1751-end).
2. Antigone (1-847, 1099-555, 1670-end), Theseus (887-1043).
3. Stranger (36-80), Ismene (324-509, 1670-end), Theseus (551-667, 1099-210, 1500-55), Creon (728-1043), Polyneices (1254-446).

Mute. Ismene (1099-555).

This distribution has been widely accepted—by Croiset, Navarre, Flickinger, and others.<sup>5</sup> Hermann claimed (pp. 43-4) that the division of Theseus' part between all three actors would not be noticed because of the variations in his mood from scene to scene: 'nimirum longe alios idem mores ostendit iis in scenis, ubi Oedipum et Antigonom placide consolatur, . . . alios autem illic, ubi Creontis importunitati

<sup>1</sup> A strange estimate of Sophocles' dramatic skill.

<sup>2</sup> p. 187: cf. Kaff, p. 22. To this point Schlesinger, p. 231, had no reply.

<sup>3</sup> *Attic Theatre*<sup>3</sup>, 1907, p. 224 (cf. p. 236). Among other scholars advocating the assumption of only three actors in the *O.C.* are: Schmid-Stählin, *Christi Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 1908, i, p. 301, n. 6; V. Inama, *Il Teatro Antico greco e romano*, Milan, 1910, p. 125; Guglielmino, p. 87, n. 1 and p. 101; T. B. L. Webster,

*An Introduction to Sophocles*, 1936, p. 121.

<sup>4</sup> *Disputatio de distributione personarum inter histriones in tragoediis Graecis*, Marburg, 1840, pp. 42-4.

<sup>5</sup> Croiset, op. cit. iii<sup>3</sup>, p. 258, n. 1; O. Navarre, *Dionysos*, 1895, p. 216; Flickinger, pp. 180-1. The cast given by Schneidewin, *Oedipus auf Kolonos*, 2nd ed. 1854, Einleitung, p. 36, is the same, except that he attributes the Messenger to the third actor: but this clashes with Ismene's part from 1670 to the end.

resistit. . . .<sup>1</sup> At the same time he rather contradictorily propounded an unlikely theory that the audience was intended to watch the changes of actors among parts and so to follow a supposedly intended dramatic irony.<sup>2</sup> Thus in the *O.C.* he considered that it was dramatically appropriate that the same actor who, in the role of Oedipus, had addressed Antigone and Ismene as a father, should, in the part of Theseus (1751-end), speak to them as guardian after Oedipus' death<sup>3</sup> (p. 44)—a fallacious opinion, as Rees showed (p. 14). The splitting of Theseus' part so offended Lachmann that he called<sup>4</sup> Hermann's cast 'ein Versuch der Verzweiflung, der auf die Lachsucht des attischen Publicums zu wenig Rücksicht nimmt'.

To avoid the division of Theseus' role among three actors, Wecklein<sup>5</sup> assigned his part from 1751 to the end to the third actor instead of to the first, and Ismene's from 1670 to the end (in consequence) to the first instead of to the third:

1. Oedipus (1-1555), Ismene (1670-end).
2. Antigone (1-847, 1099-555, 1670-end), Theseus (887-1043).
3. Stranger (36-80), Ismene (324-509), Theseus (551-667, 1099-210, 1500-55, 1751-end), Creon (728-1043), Polyneices (1254-446), Messenger (1579-669).

Mute. Ismene (1099-555).

The number of actors required to play Theseus is thus reduced from three to two, but only at the cost of also splitting Ismene's part between two regular actors (apart from the mute); which hardly seems an improvement.<sup>6</sup>

A step in the right direction was taken by Teuffel,<sup>7</sup> who introduced a *παραχορήγημα* or 'supernumerary' to play Ismene (mute) from 1099 to 1555 and to sing her part from 1724 to 1736, thereby avoiding the division of her role between two regular actors in addition to the splitting of that of Theseus (as in Wecklein's cast):

1. Oedipus.
2. Antigone, Theseus (887-1043).
3. Stranger, Ismene (324-509), Theseus (except 887-1043), Creon, Polyneices, Messenger<sup>8</sup> (1579-669).

*παραχορήγημα*. Ismene (1099-555 mute, 1670-end).

The term *παρ.* is found in several scholia and is defined by Pollux, *Onomasticon*, iv. 109, 110: *ὅπου μὴν ἀντὶ τετάρτου ὑποκριτοῦ δεῖ πινὰ τῶν χορευτῶν εἰπεῖν ἐν ᾧδῃ, παρασκήνιον καλεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὡς ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι Αἰσχύλου.*<sup>9</sup> *εἰ δὲ τέταρτος ὑποκριτὴς τι*

<sup>1</sup> It may be remarked in passing that it seems strange that Hermann here believes the three actors capable of playing the same role when elsewhere (pp. 25-31) he lays particular stress on differences in the various actors' abilities.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 32-3, 'ut etiamsi spectatores, id quod vix evitari poterat, prioris actorem in posteriori recognoscerent, ipsa recordatione voluptas . . . non imminueretur . . .' etc.

<sup>3</sup> Schneidewin, *Einl.*, p. 36, 'Theseus . . . den Töchtern gegenüber jetzt gleichsam Vaterstelle einnimmt'.

<sup>4</sup> *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* (Jahns *Jahrbücher*), xxxi. i (1841), pp. 456-7.

<sup>5</sup> N. Wecklein, *Oed. Col.*, 1880, *Einleitung*, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Flickinger hinted (p. 181) at a modification of Wecklein's scheme; Ismene's part 1670-end could be acted by the mute who plays her role from 1099 to 1555, and her lyrics 1724-36 sung, off-stage, by the third actor who was about to enter as Theseus at 1751: this is the suggestion

of Kaffenberger (q.v.). The splitting of Ismene's part is thus avoided, but Theseus remains divided between two actors. Other possible distributions are not here mentioned, as all involve considerably greater difficulties.

<sup>7</sup> W. Teuffel, 'Die Rollenvertheilung im sophokleischen Oedipus auf Kolonos', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F. ix (1854), pp. 136-8.

<sup>8</sup> Teuffel assigns the Messenger to the third actor, but the part might be equally well played by the first.

<sup>9</sup> The words *ὡς ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι Αἰσχύλου*, condemned as spurious by Dindorf, may refer to *Cho.* 900-2, since 'plays in a trilogy were sometimes quoted under the name of the first of the series, and ancient authorities are very casual in their references' (Sikes and Willson, *Prometheus Vinculus*, 1898, p. 143). Pollux apparently considered that these lines were spoken by a supernumerary. The schol. *ad loc.* (quoted above), however, believed the lines to have been de-

παρὰ  
φθέρ  
to sp  
short  
Both  
doubt  
situat  
chore  
comm  
tion.  
gener  
the p  
produ  
questi  
excell  
opinio  
other  
a very  
limita  
Navar  
acteur  
etc. I  
muets  
Proba  
qui ét  
ments  
quand  
Teuffe  
reason  
betwe  
Th  
but al  
the gr  
splitti  
the m  
produ  
887 to  
third  
two ac  
livered  
Pylades  
οἰκετής)  
Attic T  
1 'Th  
Philolog  
2 O.  
p. 184;  
tur des  
Sprache  
selbst w  
Spreche  
gewesen  
3 G.  
4599-5



# DIVISION OF PARTS IN SOPHOCLES' OEDIPUS COLONEUS 145

παραθέγγειτο, τοῦτο παραχορήγημα ὀνομάζεται. The force of the preposition in παραθέγγειτο has been emphasized by Jebb (*O.C.*, p. 8): the actor is 'one who was allowed to speak a few incidental (παρα-) words', i.e. a supernumerary who could undertake short parts in the rare cases where the poet required more than three characters. Both the genuineness of the *παρ.* and the validity of Teuffel's use of it have been doubted by Rees; he held (p. 79) that the assumption of a *παρ.* 'would simplify the situation somewhat, but does not avoid the introduction of a fourth actor. A "parachoregema" in such a case is merely another name for a fourth actor. The distinction commonly drawn between "hypocritēs" and "parachoregema" is a modern invention. . . . No such distinction existed in the classical period'. In accordance with his general theory, he believed that the employment of this 'extra' commenced only in the post-classical period of the actor-guilds<sup>1</sup> and 'had no application to dramatic production at Athens in the fifth century' (*So-called Rule*, p. 15, n. 1). On this question Flickinger does not commit himself, but his conclusion appears to be an excellent summary (p. 182): 'The technique of composition also makes it clear in my opinion that extra performers, if such were in fact engaged, were not on a par with the other three nor employed freely throughout the play but merely recited or sang a very few lines at those crises in the dramatic economy which were occasioned by the limitation in the number of regular actors.' Much the same is the conclusion of Navarre:<sup>2</sup> 'Il importe d'ailleurs de préciser exactement la portée de la loi des trois acteurs. N'étaient pas comptées comme tels les *utilités*, serviteurs, gardes, confidentes, etc. Il n'y avait pas de tragédie qui ne comportât quelques uns de ces figurants muets, et leur nombre dépendait des exigences de l'action et de la libéralité du chorège. Probablement aussi on ne considérait pas comme un quatrième acteur tel comparse, à qui était confié à l'occasion un bout de rôle de quelques vers.' Support for these statements may be found in a scholium of Acro (on *Hor. A.P.* 192): 'quartam personam quando inducimus aut omnino non loqui debet [i.e. mute] aut pauca [i.e. παραχορήγημα]'. Teuffel's division of Ismene's part between a regular actor and a *παρ.* seems perfectly reasonable in view of the not infrequent occurrence of similar divisions of parts between an actor and a mute, of which G. Richter gives a list.<sup>3</sup>

Thus it may be assumed that Teuffel made legitimate use of the παραχορήγημα; but although his distribution has won a certain amount of approval,<sup>4</sup> it contains the great defect, which it shares with all the above-mentioned three-actor casts, of splitting the part of Theseus. To this splitting there are numerous weighty objections, the most important being that of realism. How, for instance, in the actual stage-production, was it possible for the second actor to imitate, in the long scene from 887 to 1043, the exact style and presentation of Theseus already delineated by the third actor (551-667)?<sup>5</sup> As Müller (*loc. cit.*) stressed, 'It is . . . far more difficult for two actors to represent one part in the same tone and spirit than for one actor to

livered by the third actor, who had changed into Pylades' mask from that of the Messenger (or *οἰκετὴς*). Cf. p. 147, n. 1 below, and Haigh, *Attic Theatre*<sup>3</sup>, 1907, p. 234, n. 2.

<sup>1</sup> 'The Meaning of Parachoregema', *Classical Philology*, ii (1907), pp. 387-400.

<sup>2</sup> O. Navarre, *Le Théâtre grec*, Paris, 1925, p. 184; cf. Wilamowitz, *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* (in *Die gr. und lat. Lit. und Sprache*, 1912), p. 84, 'und warum sollte nicht, selbst wenn kein Extrahonorar bewilligt war, ein Sprecher für ein paar Worte aufzutreiben gewesen sein?'

<sup>3</sup> G. Richter, *De mutis personis quae in*

*tragoedia atque comoedia Attica in scaenam producuntur*, Halis Saxonum, 1934, p. 77.

<sup>4</sup> Both L. Campbell and Jebb appear to have accepted it.

<sup>5</sup> The words of Oedipus addressed to Theseus when the latter enters the scene (891 ὦ φίλτατ', ἔγνω γὰρ τὸ προσφώνημά σου) seem to render this argument incontrovertible. If Theseus was, in fact, here represented by a different actor from the one who had previously taken the part, how could Sophocles have ventured gratuitously to draw the audience's close attention to the new actor's voice by putting into Oedipus' mouth a statement which might so easily be refuted?



represent *several* parts with the appropriate modifications.' Donaldson<sup>1</sup> answered that 'the mask and the uniformity of tragic declamation would make it as easy for two actors to represent one part as for one actor to sustain several characters'. Closer to the truth, it seems, is the opinion of Rees (p. 46): 'It is quite impossible for two actors to play the same rôle in the same manner, spirit, and with a like voice. It is, furthermore, unlikely that the three actors were of the same size. The frequent appearance of Theseus adds to the difficulties of assuming that he was impersonated each time by a different actor. The spectator's conception of King Theseus would have been seriously marred at the conclusion of the performance if three actors of different statures, of unlike temperaments and mannerisms, and of unlike voices had attempted to interpret the part.' Schneidewin (p. 36), following Hermann (pp. 43-4, quoted above), considered the splitting of Theseus' part would not be observed 'als Theseus in verschiedenen Scenen in sehr verschiedener Stellung und Stimmung erscheint', and Croiset (iii<sup>3</sup>, p. 258, n. 1) defended it on the ground that 'le rôle de Thésée n'implique aucune passion, rien de personnel par conséquent, et que dès lors l'identité du personnage pouvait être suffisamment conservée par celle du masque et du costume'; this argument is countered by Wilamowitz,<sup>2</sup> who emphasized that Theseus' part is 'eine ganz einfache Rolle, die nur würdige Haltung und korrekte Rezitation verlangt'. Next must be considered two points connected with the construction of the play. Is it in accordance with artistic principles of composition to divide between two or more actors the role of that character who is—in dramatic importance probably, and in length of part certainly—second only to Oedipus? Again, in the words of Ascherson (p. 751), 'in einem Stücke, das zum Lobe und zur Verherrlichung Athens gedichtet, an den grossen Dionysien in Athen aufgeführt ward, soll die Rolle des attischen Nationalhelden Theseus der Reihe nach von allen drei Schauspielern gespielt worden sein?'—especially in view of the fact that 'ce rôle de Thésée devait charmer les Athéniens. . . Thésée, c'était Athènes elle-même personnifiée'.<sup>3</sup> Finally, it should be remembered that there is no proved instance in extant Greek tragedy of the division of a part between two regular actors, a circumstance which throws grave doubt on any such resort in the O.C.

To obviate these objections a new assignment of parts is here suggested:

1. Oedipus (1-1555), Messenger (1579-669).
2. Antigone (1-circa 509 or 707, 1099-555, 1670-end), Creon (728-1043).
3. Stranger (36-80), Ismene (324-509), Theseus (551-667, 887-1043, 1099-210, 1500-55, 1751-end), Polyneices (1254-446).

παραχορήγημα. Antigone (circa 509 or 720-847), Ismene (1099-555 mute, 1670-end).

In this manner, Theseus is assigned *complete* to one actor, a result obtained by allotting to the same *παρ.* (already rightly assumed by Teuffel for the latter half of Ismene's part) a small additional role, viz. that of Antigone from about 509 (or 707) to 847, in order to enable the second actor to appear at 728 as Creon. It would not be difficult for the supernumerary to take over Antigone's part at any period between 509 and 720, since Antigone in this long scene is so completely in the background that her movements would scarcely be noticed. The change-over could be quite unobtrusively performed if Antigone escorted Ismene off the stage at 509 and the 'extra' came on in her place. It seems quite reasonable to conclude that Ismene spoke the words *χωροῖμι' ἂν ἐς τὸδ'* to Oedipus and the Chorus, and then walked to the parodos, followed by Antigone: when they were both partly or entirely out of sight, Ismene could say 'Ἀντιγόνη, σὺ δ' ἐνθάδε | φύλασσε πατέρα τόνδε, and the 'extra', dressed identically with the second actor, could return into view immediately, in apparent compliance with

<sup>1</sup> *The Theatre of the Greeks*, 8th ed., p. 307, n. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Die dramatische Technik des S.*, p. 333, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> H. Patin, *Études sur les Tragiques grecs, Sophocle*, 6th ed., 1881, p. 227.

# DIVISION OF PARTS IN SOPHOCLES' OEDIPUS COLONEUS 147

this request. A second possibility is that Antigone, during the choral ode 707-15, made gestures indicating that she could see strangers approaching and herself walked off the stage as if to meet them. The supernumerary could then return in her place to announce the arrival of Creon and his attendants, while Antigone's actor enters a little later as Creon.<sup>1</sup> Such a change-over seems preferable to the infringement of the three-actor rule or the frequent splitting of the very much longer and more important part of Theseus among two or more *regular* actors.

As Ismene, the *παρ.* would be mute from 1099 to 1555, and between 1670 and the end would have to speak nothing more than a few incidental remarks between 1724 and 1736,<sup>2</sup> totalling only thirty-two words. The brevity of these utterances would give the audience little opportunity to detect any difference in voice from the Ismene of 324-509. In addition, Ismene's part previously was all dialogue, here it is all lyric. As Flickinger observed (p. 178), 'the difference between the singing and the speaking voice would help to conceal the temporary substitution of another actor'. The 'extra's' role is equally small in the part of Antigone: in the whole scene from 509 or 720 to 847 he would have to speak five whole lines (720, 721, 723, 828, and 844) and four half-lines (722, 829, 845, and 846), merely forty-three words in all. Since these few lines are all uttered in tense excitement or grief, and are thus in themselves different from the calm and kindly tones of the greater part of Antigone's previous speeches, the audience would not be likely to remark the change of voice. In the matter of size, too, the second and third actors would presumably be given very similar costumes for their roles as Antigone and Ismene respectively. The supernumerary would therefore be able to play both parts with ease. There is admittedly no direct evidence for the conclusion that a *παρ.* could be employed for two subsidiary parts in turn in the same play, but the parallel case of mute characters, of which an almost unlimited number was available, makes this appear a reasonable assumption.

E. B. CEADEL.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

<sup>1</sup> For changing mask and costume the actor would be able to make use of the short gap between the end of the ode and the beginning of the dialogue as well as the eight lines of conversation 720-7. Compare the very similar instance in Aesch. *Cho.* 891-9, on which Flickinger (p. 179) comments, 'This would be a "lightning" change indeed. . . . Yet the ancient scholiast accepts it

and I do not believe we are warranted in pronouncing it impossible'.

<sup>2</sup> Jebb and most edd. assign 1688-92 and 1715-19 to Ismene, against the MSS., which continue them to Antigone. L. Campbell (1st ed. 1871, only) followed the MSS. (see his notes on 1687 and 1716). It would make little difference, however, if Ismene sang 1688-92 and 1715-19 as well.

# PINDAR, PYTHIANS, v. 15 ff.

τὸ μὲν, ὅτι βασιλεὺς  
ἔσσι· μεγαλᾶν πόλιων  
ἔχει συγγενῆς  
ὄφθαλμός αἰδοῦτάτων γέρας  
τεῦ τοῦτο μειγνύμενον φρενί.  
μάκαρ δὲ καὶ νῦν κτλ.

PROFESSOR H. J. ROSE's article in *C.Q.* xxxiii. 69 f. has advanced the study of this perplexing passage in two important respects. He has observed that, in order to determine the 'eye' as metaphorical, ὄφθαλμός requires a dependent genitive, and he has therefore restored μεγαλᾶν πόλιων to this relation by punctuating as above instead of after πόλιων. And he is surely equally right in maintaining that this plural genitive must have a plural reference; it must mean 'of great cities' and not 'of Cyrene'. For although there is a figure called *pluralis maiestatis*, such obscurity in the use of it seems too affected, such ambiguity too perverse; a poem honouring the prince of Cyrene will refer to this famous city in unmistakable terms.

Yet I feel that Prof. Rose has pointed the way to a solution rather than attained it. I still cannot see that the sentence from μεγαλᾶν to φρενί is articulate speech. From R.'s translation<sup>1</sup> I can extract no real sense; and his explanation is in substance nothing better than 'Native kings have kingship, and kingship suits you'. But who would say that kings, whether native or not, have kingship?

ὄφθαλμός in this sentence can have only one reference; it must mean Cyrene. This is indicated by two quite separate considerations. As Pindar's own ὄφθαλμός Σικελίας (the Emmenidae) is (politically) a part of Sicily, as the ὄφθ. ἀνθέων (rose) of Achilles Tatius, ii. 1 is itself a flower, as Catullus's *insularum ocellus* is itself an island, *μεγ. πολ. ὄφθ.* must be a great city, and that, in this context, will have to be Cyrene. Again, there are only two things of which it can be said that they 'have' this most august office, kingship, in combination with the mind of Arcesilas; one is Cyrene, and the other Arcesilas himself; and no sense can be got by reading ἔχεις ἐγγενῆς (or ἔχεις) συγγ.) in order to understand it of the latter.

'In combination with', I have just written, and here is a word which R.'s tortuous<sup>2</sup> interpretation has compelled him to mistranslate. He has to understand μειγνύμενον as *fitting, suited to*; but where in Greek has the verb any such meaning? or how could it have? Pindar indeed, who, as it happens, uses it with greater freedom than any other author, always preserves its essential notion of effecting a union of two things. Moreover, that γέρας τοῦτο τεῦ μειγνύμενον φρενί here is to be understood thus is confirmed by an obviously parallel phrase in the first sentence of the poem, πλοῦτος ἀρετῇ κεκραμένος.

μεγαλᾶν πόλιων ὄφθαλμός will be Athens to some Greeks, Syracuse to others, to Pindar Thebes; if the compliment is to denote Cyrene, ὄφθαλμός must be limited by some allusive epithet. συγγενῆς here cannot fulfil that function; indeed συγγενῆς ὄφθαλμός here is—in my opinion—nonsense, and to devise a context in which it would not be nonsense should take some ingenuity.<sup>3</sup> The specifically Pindaric periphrasis

<sup>1</sup> 'First, thou art a king; the native-born glory (treasure, most valuable thing) of great cities hath this most reverend office, and well it fits thy temper.'

<sup>2</sup> Not more tortuous, however, than previous renderings, whether without emendation or

with it.

<sup>3</sup> When is an eye *not* congenital? Only when it is a glass eye. But I could understand a kindred eye as the eye of a kinsman; or as in *Ar. Ach.* 789.

for Cyrene  
συγγενῆς  
to the  
(Meleag  
(quoted  
Pis. 20.  
notorio  
not me  
a them  
other (I  
The chi  
and poi  
that po  
the fir  
δεσπότη  
Let  
the hun  
austerit  
someth  
κελαινε  
others)  
eye' dic  
κελαινε  
in κελα  
Stru  
though  
phrased  
has in t  
R.'s ser  
νεανίαν  
A wo  
by com  
entire p  
the Arc  
on the c  
that Cy  
interrel

UNIV

<sup>1</sup> In (e  
(1936) th  
as having  
it unique  
tremity o  
view tha  
while rig  
the com  
verdure  
frequentl  
correspon  
Pindar's  
Mediterra  
1800 B.C.

for Cyrene is to be got by adding to the given three words the epithet *συννεφής*. Unlike *συγγενής* this is a term which a poet might, and which Greek poets in fact do, apply to the eye; *συννέφουσιν ὄμματα* Eur. *El.* 1078, *σύννεφες ὄμμα* Anth. Pal. xii. 159. 5 (Meleager); cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 228 f., Soph. *Ant.* 528, Eur. *Hipp.* 172, Pind. *Py.* i. 7 f. (quoted below), Hor. *Epist.* i. xviii. 94, Sil. viii. 611, Stat. *Theb.* iv. 512, Cic. *in Pis.* 20. But the point of the epithet here is that in its literal sense it alludes to the notorious feature (Hdt. iv. 158 *fin.*) of the climate of Cyrenaica<sup>1</sup> which made Cyrene not merely prosperous but habitable at all; a feature as notorious, and as natural a theme of poetical allusion, as the phenomenon which gave moisture to the only other (main) habitable region of the East African desert (Hdt. ii. 5. 1, Eur. *Hel.* 1-3). The chief recommendation of all, however, is that this solution besides giving sense and point to our passage brings it into exact correspondence with *Py.* iv. 52; for in that poem which celebrates the same victory of King Arcesilas, his ancestor Battus, the first holder of his *αἰδιούτατον γέρας*, is alluded to as *φῶτα κελαινεφών*<sup>2</sup> *πεδίων δεσπότην*.

Let no one suggest that because 'beclouded eye (eyebrow, brow)' as applied to the human countenance in my first group of references implies gloom or sorrow or austerity, therefore the phrase even when thus wittily transfigured must still carry something too uncomplimentary for its present context. Against that there is *κελαινεφών* in the passage just quoted. Moreover, though in this respect (as in some others) he may remain unique among ancient poets, the conception 'beclouded eye' did not in itself convey anything disagreeable to Pindar. Witness *Py.* i. 7 f. *κελαινῶπιν . . . νεφέλαν, . . . γλεφάρων ἀδὲ κλάιστρον*. This passage provides also in *κελαινῶπιν* a verbal bridge between our two descriptions of Cyrene.

Structure and sense alike are now perfectly straightforward and simple, and though the verbal play cannot—naturally—be translated it can be suitably paraphrased. 'First, in that thou art king; the dark-browed Paragon of mighty cities has in thee a union of this most august of offices with high powers of mind.' To R.'s sentence I know no parallel, but for mine cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 188 ff. *πόλις δὲ σὴ . . . νεανίαν . . . ἔχει σὲ ποιμένι ἐσθλόν*.

A word that some might call 'nearer' is *συντελής*, which I could defend sophistically by comparing Aesch. *Agam.* 532-7<sup>3</sup> and by pointing to the emphasis on wealth in the entire preceding context of this ode; one remembers also the anti-capitalist satire of the Arcesilas vase. But no; a man and an eye will hardly be business partners; while on the other hand there is the awkwardness of *μεγαλὰν πόλιων* to suggest alternatively that Cyrene is the leading 'light' of some *συντέλεια* or confederacy; and generally the interrelations involved by such a sentence are altogether too complex.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

<sup>1</sup> In (e.g.) the *Oxford Advanced Atlas*, ed. 5 (1936) the coastal fringe of Cyrenaica is shown as having a 4-in. rainfall in January which makes it unique between Tunis and the eastern extremity of the continent. (So much for Christ's view that this interpretation of *Py.* iv. 52 is—while right—'rerum naturae contrarium'). And the comparative humidity—and consequent verdure and fertility—of this region have frequently been mentioned by our newspaper correspondents in the recent campaign. But in Pindar's time the rainfall here, as in the Mediterranean generally, was considerably larger; 1800 B.C. to A.D. 500 is reckoned the period of

'the "classical" rainfall maximum' by climatologists, who even refer specifically to a subsequent 'desiccation of Cyrenaica.' See e.g. C. E. P. Brooks, *The Evolution of Climate* (Benn, 1922), pp. 140-2, 147-8, a reference which I owe to my colleague Professor Roxby.

<sup>2</sup> As to sense I follow (for reasons already here implicit) the ordinary interpretation (e.g. Christ, Gildersleeve, Schroeder (ed. 1922), Sandys, Puech, Wade-Gery-Bowra, Farnell), not the curious heresy of (e.g.) Heyne and (still) Liddell-Scott-Jones.

<sup>3</sup> Where the connexion of 532 with 537 (*διπλὰ δ' ἔτεισαν*) is hardly appreciated.



## NOTES ON PLAUTUS

THE investigation of which the following remarks are the result was suggested to me by the perusal of E. Fraenkel's book *Plautinisches im Plautus*. Since Max Schuster's dissertation<sup>1</sup> nothing of importance seems to have been done to point out features of Roman religion in the Plautine comedies.<sup>2</sup> Schuster's opinions have been almost universally accepted. For this reason I hope that the remarks offered herewith, even if they do not meet with the approval of Plautine scholars, will at least serve to start new investigations on the part of people more competent than myself.

### AESCULAPIUS

In *Curc.* 389 we read: 'quis hic est operto capite qui Aesculapium salutatur?' Since this god would naturally be worshipped *Graeco ritu*, the passage has attracted much attention. Schuster (8, 9), who ascribes this to the Greek original, compares the Plutos of Aristophanes (692, 707). But these passages do not deal with a prayer; they refer to the process of incubation itself, while in Plautus we have a *salutatio*, or better *proskynesis*, in the sense in which this has been treated by W. Kroll.<sup>3</sup> The two quotations in Lodge's *Lexicon Plautinum*<sup>4</sup> have nothing of religious significance in them. In fact, our passage itself has no relation to the incubation of Cappadox, the pander, who does not appear on the stage until the very end of the scene (455). Curculio is trying to fool the moneylender with his forged seal (369). To this end he accosts him, pretending not to know who he is (391), although he has recognized him (390). It is clear, then, that some peculiarity in Lyco's behaviour among the throng moving in the street (288, 293) drew Curculio's attention. This is evidently the gesture of adoration made by that man *operto capite*, which must thus be interpreted as something out of the ordinary. It does not follow with certainty, however, that Plautus has substituted a feature of Roman religion for a Greek one. Lyco may have some perfectly natural reason for wanting to conceal his identity. In fact, since he is meditating how he can avoid paying his just debts (373), his wish not to be recognized is quite intelligible. That his piety in saluting the temple, as he passes it, serves to betray him is a nice piece of humour.

### AUGURIES AND AUSPICES

These two topics have been satisfactorily treated by Gulick and Valetton.<sup>2</sup> It is almost self-evident that in a specifically Roman field Plautus has made use of Latin technical terms, such as *impetrare*, *inauguratum*, *admittunt*, *temerarium*, *obscaevavit*, and *liquidus*. In a very few instances I am able to add to the labours of these predecessors. Thus *Aul.* 624 is considered Greek by Schuster (42), in spite of the use of the evidently technical term *croccire*. The passage has also been misunderstood by Steier,<sup>5</sup> who, in spite of Plautus' *a laeva manu*, gives this line (and 669) as proof of the good significance of the raven's appearance in flight from the right side, while Euclio speaks of the cawing of the bird and is badly frightened and deterred from action by it (669).

<sup>1</sup> Max Schuster, *Quomodo Plautus Attica exemplaria transtulerit*, diss. Gryph. 1884.

<sup>2</sup> Some pertinent literature is given in the bibliography of Lodge's *Lexicon Plautinum*. F. Leo, *Plautinische Studien*<sup>2</sup>, and E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, have treated the topic in passing. Gulick, 'Omens and Augury' in

*Harvard Studies in Philology*, vii (1896). Valetton, *Mnemosyne*, xvii and ff. Niebergall, *Griechische Religion u. Mythologie in der ältesten Literatur der Römer*, diss. Giessen 1937.

<sup>3</sup> *RE*, Suppl. v. 517-19.

<sup>4</sup> *Curc.* 288; 293.

<sup>5</sup> *RE*, i A. 21, 60.

Distinctly Roman also is *Asin.* 262: 'picus ulmum tundit. hau temerariumst.' The slave concludes that he will be whipped because the woodpecker is pecking at an elm. *Ulmæ virgæ* seem to have been the preferred material (cf. e.g. *Asin.* 363) for the rods with which slaves were scourged. For the contrast between the brutal treatment of Roman slaves and the relative humaneness of Greek masters see Westermann.<sup>1</sup> Here also Steier<sup>2</sup> has grossly misunderstood, when he quotes our passage for the evil meaning of the appearance (261: 'consuadent; certum herclest uostram consequi sententiam').

## BACCHANALIA

The year 186 B.C. marks the final suppression of the 'hellenistic' Bacchic mysteries which, no matter how much Livy (xxxix. 8-15) has adorned his tale, certainly had become an unbearable scandal. Richard Reitzenstein<sup>3</sup> has shown, with the aid of epigraphic documents and of Cichorius, that their origin is most likely to be found in Egypt. This brings us to the end of the third century<sup>4</sup> and to that time lines 211 ff. assign the Miles Gloriosus. Now, in the same play, at 1016 ff., Milphidippa says to Palaestrio: 'cedo signum si harum Baccharum es.' The *signum* is the ring which had been sent to the bramarbas by Acroteleutium. It seems by no means too bold to read into this line an allusion to the notorious Bacchanalia, whose existence may well have been a matter of unofficial gossip years before the Senate became obliged to note it officially. I think it improbable that the passage found a place in the Greek original, because the testimony for Dionysiac mysteries in Attica belongs almost exclusively to imperial times.<sup>5</sup> Still, it is just possible that an Athenian poet, who laid his scene in Ephesus, may have known of the Asiatic celebrations.<sup>6</sup>

Another allusion to the same mysteries seems to be contained in *Bac.* 53: 'Bacchas metuo et Bacchanal.' The production of this play is usually assigned to 189 B.C. on account of line 1073, though Sonnenberg<sup>7</sup> considers that 187 may also be defended. Our passage may be adduced in support of this later date, especially in view of 371, 373: 'Bacchæ . . . quæ hominum sorbent sanguinem', which must be a reference to the prevalent charge of human sacrifice during the celebration. Knapp,<sup>8</sup> following Ritschl, sees an allusion to the decree of the Senate also in *Cas.* 980. However, Mommsen<sup>9</sup> denies this because he believes that the police would not have tolerated such a reference. In this I think he is right, and I also subscribe to his remark that one might invert the conclusion: the allusion must have preceded the official steps against the mysteries.

## CERES, CERRITUS, LARVATUS, INTEMPERIE

Everything on this head has been very satisfactorily treated by the late Dorothy M. Paschall,<sup>10</sup> with whose rejection of Altheim's speculations I thoroughly agree. I do not, however, approve of her characterization of Ceres as 'an agricultural spirit'. Semen, the root of Semones, ought, I think, to be referred to the human sperm, like Genius.<sup>11</sup> As for Paschall's explanation of *intemperie* as a medical term, doubts are justified, for at least once<sup>12</sup> we are told that thunderstorms cause insanity. The basic

<sup>1</sup> *RE*, Suppl. vi. 978.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* iii A. 1550, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*<sup>3</sup>, 101-5.

<sup>4</sup> Ptolemy Philopator died in 205; Lepidus was in Egypt in 201.

<sup>5</sup> See the discussion by Kern, *RE*, xvi. 1201, 1202, with whom I agree.

<sup>6</sup> Schuster (40) also sees here an allusion to the *Bacchanalia* and so does L. Gurlitt, *Erotica*

*Plautina*, 123.

<sup>7</sup> *RE*, xiv. 103.

<sup>8</sup> *AJP*, xl. 244.

<sup>9</sup> *Roem. Gesch.*<sup>8</sup> i. 896.

<sup>10</sup> *Language Dissertations*, No. 27 (1939), 60-9.

<sup>11</sup> Apparently this is also Link's view, *RE*, i A.

2252, 54.

<sup>12</sup> Seneca, *N.Q.* ii. 27, 3.

idea of insanity as 'possession' by an evil spirit is also borne out by the passage *Poen.* 528: 'neque nos populus pro cerritis insectabit lapidibus', for it seems that stoning is originally an apotropaeic rite.<sup>1</sup>

#### DIES AS A GOD

*Bac.* 255, which groups Volcanus, Luna, Sol, Dies as 'di quattuor', deserves more than the somewhat cavalier treatment of Wissowa,<sup>2</sup> who compares Caesar, *B.G.* vi. 21. 2, where Sol, Volcanus, and Luna are mentioned, and the statement by Varro that Titus Tatius erected altars to Volcanus, Sol, and Luna. In both quotations it is precisely the fourth god, Dies, who is missing. It is clear that night and day are coupled here and that for each period of time two gods are named. We may compare the 'prologue' to the *Mercator*, 4, 5, 'qui aut Nocti aut Dii aut Soli aut Lunae miseriae narrat suas', with which Schuster (30) compares Theocritus, ii. 69, though to me the line does not appear pertinent.

In both Plautus passages the chiasmic arrangement is noteworthy. Volcanus must correspond to Dies and thus ought to signify the night.<sup>3</sup> But against this it can be argued that according to 256 all the gods must be divinities of light (*inluxere*). Now at least in *Amph.* 341 Vulcanus is metonymically used for the lantern. Thus his mention in our passage may stand for the illumination of a—moonless—nocturnal darkness. In view of the fact that the Roman Volcanus represents preponderantly the destructive force of fire,<sup>4</sup> it would seem unlikely that we are dealing here with a Roman conception of the god. My search for a similar connotation in the sphere of the Greek Hephaistos has so far been unsuccessful.

It is different, however, as regards Dies. Though Hemera occurs in Hesiod and elsewhere as a member of genealogical combinations, she has nowhere reached the status of a real person. But it is otherwise in the Latin sphere, where we have at least one votive inscription from Mauretania.<sup>5</sup> Plautus, *Capt.* 464 'huic die ecodiam oculos', manifestly invests the day with a body; the quaint conceit that one can abolish the existence of the day by depriving it of eyesight may have its origin in ideas pertaining to the evil eye<sup>6</sup> or it may belong to that sphere of thought which led the Greeks to speak of the sun as the eye of the day.<sup>7</sup> The former idea is shared alike by Greeks and Romans, while the latter appears to be Greek, influenced by Stoic philosophy. We are thus again led back into the Greek sphere. Fraenkel (108) remarks on *Capt.* 468 'esurialis ferias' and *Persa* 780 'pessumus hic mihi dies inluxit corruptor': 'terminology of the Roman sacred calendar; the day is characterized as having a definite individuality'; and on page 109 he says about *Cas.* 510 'nostro omine it dies': 'the Romans used to examine the day for its appropriateness.'<sup>8</sup> He thus holds an opposite view. Similarly Waltzing in his edition of the *Captivi* calls 464 'typically Roman' and compares Horace, *Sat.* i. 9, 72 'huncine solem tam nigrum surrexe mihi', which has, however, only a very slight resemblance. At the most then we may concede here a certain colouring of a Greek original by a Roman belief.

#### DIVUS FIDIUS

Wissowa and, following him, Link<sup>9</sup> quote *Asin.* 23 for the phrase 'me Divus Fidius

<sup>1</sup> *RE*, s.v. 'Lapidatio', 'Steinigung', 'Steinkult'; Hirzel, *Abh. Saechs. Ges. d. Wiss.* xxvii (1909), 212 n. 9, 244, 250, 253.

<sup>2</sup> *ML*, vi. 365, 366.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Merc.* 4, where *Nocti* corresponds to *Luna*.

<sup>4</sup> As such V. appears at *Epid.* 673: 'Volcani iratist filius; quaquā tangit, omne amburit, si adest, aestu calefacit.'

<sup>5</sup> *ML*, i, s.v. 'Dies Bonus'.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. 465: 'ita malignitate oneravit omnis mortalit mihi.'

<sup>7</sup> Gruppe, *Myth. and Relg.* 380 n. 2. Cf. Manilius, *Astr.* iv. 906: 'victorque ad sidera mittit sidereos oculos.'

<sup>8</sup> Cf. p. 184: the marking of a certain day in this manner seems to be connected with Roman superstition.

<sup>9</sup> *RK*<sup>2</sup>, 131 n. 1; *RE*, i A. 2253. 50.

(iuvet)'. An examination of the context proves them both to be in error. In 16-22 the slave Libanus implores his master Demaenetus as follows: 'As you wish your only son to survive you, I call on you by your ripe age and the wife, whom you fear. May your wife on the contrary survive you, if you tell me a lie.' To this D. replies: 'You ask me by *Dius Fidius*; I see that oath-bound I must speak.' Now how does the master come to say that the slave has invoked *Dius Fidius*, although the god had not been mentioned at all by him? It seems clear to me that this is a conclusion drawn by Demaenetus from the mention of his son's life and the implied curse on the youth's continued existence. It is of course possible, though not at all plausible, that Plautus is here rendering a *Zeus Pistios* of his original. It is interesting to note the parallel to Homer, *Il.* ii. 259, 260, where Odysseus invokes a curse on his own life and that of his only son.

In his treatment of *Dius Fidius*<sup>1</sup> and of *Sancus*,<sup>1</sup> Wissowa, again followed by Link, withdrew his former acceptance<sup>2</sup> of Reifferscheid's identification of the god with the *Genius Iovis* and *Hercules*.<sup>3</sup> It would appear that our *Asinaria* passage, which none of the aforesaid scholars mentions, can be used to strengthen Reifferscheid's argument and refute the later explanation of Wissowa and Link.<sup>4</sup> The passage is important also in showing that the oath by *Dius Fidius* was considered as very strongly binding.

## DIVINERS

The Plautine passages referring to these gentry have been collected and discussed by Gulick<sup>5</sup> under the headings of *hariolus* and *superstitiosus*. He correctly emphasizes the close connexion of *hariolus* and *haruspex*. Langen<sup>6</sup> discusses the same topic. I may add, however, that at least *M.G.* 691 ff. shows some affinity with Menander's *Misogynes* 4, 5: 'the gods torment the married men most, for to the women *ἀεί τινα ἄγαν ἐορτήν ἐστ' ἀνάγκη*.' And for *hariolatur* as *vera dicit* we may refer to the *Peri-keiromene* of the same poet, 181.

## ELEMENTS, DEIFIED

The passage *Pseud.* 351 has so far not been satisfactorily explained. It is not made more perspicuous by its textual uncertainties. Yet it seems certain to me that *tetigit* is the true reading. This leaves the troublesome nominative *terra*, for which *terram* has been conjectured.<sup>7</sup> The oath sworn by the pander then would have invoked either *Terra* or *Tellus*. The latter, however, occurs in oaths only once on Italic soil<sup>8</sup> and may occur even here under Greek influence.<sup>9</sup> We are thus directed towards a Greek sphere. Here the story of a Locrian oath seems to be pertinent; these men swear to keep the peace as long as they walk on this earth.<sup>10</sup> But they had placed some soil in their shoes. After its removal they consider themselves absolved of their obligation. With this must be compared a belief widespread through northern Europe that putting earth in the shoes averts the fatal consequences of perjury.<sup>11</sup> It does not

<sup>1</sup> *RK*, 130 ff.; *ML*, iv s.v.

<sup>2</sup> *ML*, i, s.v. '*Dius Fidius*'.

<sup>3</sup> In this connexion it is important that one swears by D.F. under the open sky, just as one swears by Hercules in this way; see Hirzel, *Der Eid*, 145 n. 7.

<sup>4</sup> I do not accept, of course, the ancient etymology of D.F. as *Iovis filius*. If I interpret Hirzel (l.c.) correctly, he also agrees with Reifferscheid.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 150, n. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Plaut. Stud.* 260.

<sup>7</sup> See Lindsay's apparatus.

<sup>8</sup> *ML*, v. 338, 12-31.

<sup>9</sup> Mars is merely a conjecture of Preller's, *ML*, v. 217. The manuscript tradition has *γομάχη* *\*Hλιον*, i.e. Sol Indiges; cf. G. Koch, *Gestirnvenerung*, 73, 90.

<sup>10</sup> Polybius xii. d. 3; *RE*, xv. 348, 40.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also *ARW*, xii. 54, 55: in rendering the oath one points downwards with the fingers of the left hand. In Servia the jurant tied a linen thread round his girdle; one end of this touched the earth. See also *ARW*, xiii. 155: the fingers raised in swearing are daubed with clay.



seem too bold to see here a testimony to the same belief, and this would permit us to retain the nominative case. To this may be added the passage *Most.* 468 sqq. where the touching of earth averts the pollution incurred by touching, or merely looking at, the haunted house. The role played by the earth in the false oath and in the *Mostellaria* fits in very well with the power of earth in breaking magic and witchcraft, which I have treated in *RE.* i. 44, 32 ff.

The earth, in connexion with other elements, is also mentioned at *Trin.* 1070: 'Mare, Terra, Caelum, di vostram fidem.' It seems that Lodge, in his *Lexicon Plautinum*, and Lindsay, in his edition, take the *di* &c. as separate from the former words, since they do not give them capital letters. F. Stoessl<sup>1</sup> is undecided about the personification of elements, but is convinced that even if personified they have no religious significance. Deubner,<sup>2</sup> who limits personifications to abstract ideas, had no occasion to discuss elements in his fundamental article. We know that Earth and Heaven were invoked in oaths; the Athenian oath sworn by Zeus, Poseidon, and Demeter probably does not belong here, for it can be explained as an invocation of the highest god and of the two patrons of Athens. O. Weinreich, indeed, says:<sup>3</sup> 'Nature in all its forms bears for the ancients a double aspect, physical and animal, demonic, divine.'

There are in reality indications that the three elements were significantly combined.<sup>4</sup> The Ovid passage cited in note 4 bears upon my interpretation of the Plautine invocation because the poet calls the elements *numina*. It may then well be that the Plautus passage has preserved for us an otherwise forgotten bit of deification (I avoid the word personification because of Ovid's *numina*) of nature in Roman religion. Perhaps we may compare the *Precatio Terrae Matris*,<sup>5</sup> where Terra is addressed as 'caeli ac maris divum (=divorum?) arbitra'.

#### FABLE AND FAIRY-TALE

An allusion to a fable about crow and vulture seems to me to be found in *Most.* 832: 'Do you see the painting in which one crow mocks (? or rather picks at, *vellicat*) two vultures?' This would be the only mention in ancient literature of such a story, for it occurs in neither Aesop nor Phaedrus nor Babrius. A. Hausrath, the best authority on the fable, tells me that he recalls no reference to it anywhere. There is nothing to be gleaned from D'Arcy Thompson's *Glossary of Greek Birds*. A possible clue is contained in O. Keller's *Die Antike Tierwelt*, ii. 73: the crow is symbolic of the beggar,<sup>6</sup> for the slave Tranio wants to wheedle money from the two elders.

Another allusion to an unknown fable may be found in *Aul.* 229-35. Here Euclio compares the relations of himself and the rich Megadorus to the quarrel of ass and ox harnessed to the same cart. Particularly significant are lines 233, 234: 'I should have no permanent stable when we part; the asses would bite me, the oxen gore me.' The situation here is reminiscent of the well-known fable of the bat which tried to remain neutral in the war between birds and beasts and was afterwards attacked by both.<sup>7</sup>

That Plautus or his originals alluded to fairy-tales has long been recognized. Fraenkel (188) has rightly rejected the common explanation of *Trin.* 207 'sciunt id quod in aurem rex reginae dixerit' as a reference to the Sacred Union of the Archon

<sup>1</sup> *RE.* xix. 1050; 1058.

<sup>2</sup> *ML.* iii, s.v. 'Personifikationen'.

<sup>3</sup> *Tuebingen Beitrage*, v. 220.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. S. Sudhaus, *Rh. Mus.* lvi. 40, and Usener, *ibid.* lviii. 28, although both refer to Augustan poets (*Virg. Ed.* iv. 50; *Ov. Tr.* ii. 53). Of these the first is certainly under hellenistic influence (Norden, *Geburt d. Kindes*, 58 n. 4).

<sup>5</sup> Heim, *Incant. Mag.* No. 128, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Radermacher, *Sitzber. Ak. Wien*, 1922, 7. Knapp (*CP.* xii. 143) speaks erroneously of a raven.

<sup>7</sup> Olck's interpretation of this passage (*RE.* vi. 641, 30; 647, 69) is based on a misunderstanding of the text.

Basileus and the Basilinna, as well as the proposed allusion to Demetrios Poliorketes. In this he is apparently followed by Klinz, *Hieros Gamos*, if in this case the *argumentum ex silentio* is justified. Fraenkel speaks of a 'volkstuemlich maerchenhafte Redensart, eine Art Maerchenmotiv', and considers the passage as genuinely Roman. So also he says (197) that the king as the incorporation of power and splendour and the pair *rex-regina* are familiar symbols to the Romans. It is a bit of everyday Roman speech, with an overtone of the fairy-tale.<sup>1</sup>

The master-thief motif has been shown by Weinreich (loc. cit. 95) to underlie *Trin.* 1023: 'quorum eorum unus *surripuit* currenti cursori solum.' He has apparently overlooked the occurrence of this word again in *Trin.* 83: 'nam nunc ego si te *surripuisse* suspicer Iovi coronam de capite in Capitolio', where we assuredly have at least an attempt at Romanization by the author. With some diffidence I think it worth while considering whether we have not here an allusion to a folk-tale current in Rome.

Finally there is *Aul.* 64: 'quae in occipitio quoque habet oculos pessuma.' The expression appears to be proverbial and I suspect that, as often, the proverb is derived from some tale about a being with eyes both in front and in back—not Janus, of course—perhaps a witch. I have been unable to find anything similar either in Bolte-Polivka or in the fairy-tale material accessible to me and must leave it to those better versed in the lore of the fairy-tale to find a parallel.

#### FETIALE IUS

In *Amph.* 204-17 Plautus seems to have adapted the Roman form of declaring war. Originally the Fetiales attended to this function, but it was taken over fairly early by legati.<sup>2</sup> The men for this purpose were chosen from the senators (*viros primorum principes*, 204; *eos legat*, 205; *legati*, 215), and made the demand for restitution (206-10). Only after this had been refused (213, 214) did they declare war. A comparison with Livy i. 32 shows further similarities in what are evidently set formulae: cf. 213 'superbe increpant' with 32, 3 'superbe responsum reddunt.'

#### FIDES

The passage *Amph.* 256, 257: 'ad nos veniunt flentes principes; velatis manibus orant' &c. has been explained by Schuster (10) as equivalent to 'manibus velamenta (*στέμματα*) tenentes', and thus of decidedly Greek flavour. This seems to me untenable, even though Georges accepts the explanation and speaks of olive branches in fillets whose ends fall over the hands and thus conceal them. We are dealing here with the act of *deditio* (258, 259): 'dedunt se, divina humanaque omnia, urbem et liberos in dicionem atque in arbitrium cuncti Thebano populo.'<sup>3</sup> Even the technical terms are used here: 'in dicionem atque arbitrium, divina humanaque omnia' (Livy i. 38, 2). Instead of 'dicionem et arbitrium' we find also 'in *fidem* atque potestatem'. It is a remarkable fact that the veiled hand is especially connected with the cult of Fides.<sup>4</sup> We seem to have no ancient description of the ritual of the *deditio*, except for the words spoken during the act, so it would appear that our passage is of prime importance for the ceremony. A recollection of this part of it may be contained in Tacitus, *Hist.* iii. 31, where the inhabitants of Cremona show *velamenta et infulas* from the walls as a sign that they are ready to surrender. I should mention too that Livy xxix. 16, 6 speaks of 'velamenta supplicum ramos oleae porgentes'. But this may be purely a literary reminiscence which has led to a misinterpretation of a genuinely Roman

<sup>1</sup> Bolte-Polivka, *Anmerkungen zu Grimm's Maerchen*, iv. 45; 123; Weinreich in Friedlaender's *Sittengeschichte* 9, 10, iv; F. Marx, *ad Rudens* 1256.

<sup>2</sup> *RE*, s.v. 'Fetialis' and 'Legatus'.

<sup>3</sup> E. Taeubler (*Imperium Romanum*, 14-28) treats the act of *deditio*, but has no word about any prescribed gestures accompanying it.

<sup>4</sup> *RE*, vi, s.v. 'Fides'; Wissowa, *RK*, 134.

ritual. That we have no right to stress the use of *tendere* is shown by the fact that Tacitus speaks of *infulas tendere*, whereas we know that the *infula* was a veil drawn over the head.

*Aul.* 582, 583: 'ted auferam, aula, in Fidei fanum' and 674: 'Silvani lucus extra murum est avius, crebro salicto oppletus; ibi sumam locum.'

Since Schuster (21, 22) declared<sup>1</sup> these references to be Greek, his interpretation seems to have been generally accepted.<sup>2</sup> It is assumed that the grove of Silvanus stands for the grotto of Pan on the north slope of the Athenian acropolis, while the Fidei fanum is to be identified with an Athenian sanctuary of Pistis, mentioned by the collectors of proverbs<sup>3</sup> but otherwise unknown. Jachmann<sup>4</sup> says that the Plautine sanctuary is situated between the two houses of the neighbours, an assumption to which lines 606 and 620 furnish strong support. He also denies the existence of a Greek goddess Pistis and has rightly seen that the grove of Silvanus is considerably distant from the sanctuary of Fides. For it is said to be outside the walls and *avius* (674), and while *avius* might conceivably mean difficult of access, as the grotto of Pan is, the latter cannot possibly be said to lie outside the walls. In spite of his own reasoning he believes the passage to be Greek and sees in Fides 'Ἀγαθή Τύχη'. But lines 100-2, which he quotes, cannot be used in his support, for they merely refer to a well-known proverbial saying. I am convinced that Fraenkel (29) has seen the truth, when he calls these references 'echt roemisch'.

#### FORTUNA

The goddess Fortuna appears in a peculiar role in the *Persa* (515), where she is represented as bearing a *facula lucrifera*. Evidently this attribute is new and startling, for Dordalus asks in astonishment: 'quae istaec lucrifera est Fortuna?' But he receives only an evasive answer from Toxilus: 'istas quae norunt roga.' The remarkable part of this reply is the feminine gender of *istas*. It is not too bold, I believe, to assert that this excludes any thought of the Greek goddess Tyche and that the allusion is to the 'Fortuna in foro boario', on whose connexion with women compare Wissowa, *RK*, 257. But this does not yet explain why the goddess is equipped with the torch nor why it is called *lucrifera*. I have been unable to find any mention of a torch-holding Fortuna except a late F. Panthea (Roscher, *ML* i. 15, 35) who is said to be equipped with a 'quiver or torch'. A solution may be sought in the close relation between the Fortuna in Boario and the Mater Matuta. For the latter is said to be the bringer of the light of early morning. As such she might conceivably be represented with the torch, although this attribute is mentioned nowhere for the related Eos-Aurora. There still remains the puzzling adjective *lucrifera*, which is the emendation by Ritschl for the '*lucrifica*' of P.<sup>5</sup> The variation is, however, unimportant for our purpose. I suspect that Plautus is here guilty of a pun, preparatory to introducing the parasite's daughter Lucris. Even K. Schmidt,<sup>6</sup> who sees in the name the Greek word Locris and tries to bolster up his equation with the evil reputation of Locrian women,<sup>7</sup> concedes that 'der Anklang [to *lucrum*] ist fühlbar und auch angedeutet'. The result, it would seem, is that the Fortuna of our passage has nothing in common with the Greek Tyche and must be explained as belonging to a genuinely Roman religious conception.

Similarly Terence, *Phor.* 841, seems to me to be truly Roman. No commentator of the passage, as far as I can see, has paid any attention to the fact that the poet

<sup>1</sup> A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriech. Buehne* (1917), 28: 'jener Akt 3 muss von Plautus hinzugedichtet sein.'

<sup>2</sup> *RK*, 215 n. 10; Klotz, *RE*, iii A. 119.

<sup>3</sup> *ML*, iii. 2512.

<sup>4</sup> *Berl. Phil. Ws.* 1915, 1013.

<sup>5</sup> The reading of P seems to me to receive a certain support from *lucrificabilis*: *Pers.* 712.

<sup>6</sup> *Hermes*, xxxvii. 193, 194.

<sup>7</sup> W. Oldfather, *RE*, xiii. 1255.

dis  
acc  
wh

his  
int  
con  
pre  
no

HA

by  
the  
sum

JUN

of  
trib  
this  
reli  
hea  
cus  
'das  
add  
read  
pal  
com  
only

JUN

Rom  
mea  
the  
natu  
that  
to L  
the  
solle  
also

I  
Mer  
prop  
here

1 A  
2 I  
3 H  
4 C  
182.

distinguishes two Fortunaes, a distinction which is unknown to the Greeks. I cannot accept the explanation of Ashmore, who thinks of the two temples of the goddess which we know existed in Rome.

Finally, in *Asin.* 716 Plautus refers to the Roman Fortuna Obsequens. Carter in his *Epitheta* had already seen this, but Lodge in his *Lexicon* apparently rejects the interpretation, when on p. 181 (s.v. 'atque') he quotes our line for the conjunction as connecting two names, but with the verb in the singular. Of course, my explanation presupposes that *atque* is used here in an explicative sense, of which Lodge adduces no examples.

## HARUSPICY

In *Rudens* 135: 'petunt aulam extarem' we have a Roman colouring introduced by Plautus. For where the Greeks roasted the sacrificial entrails, the Romans boiled theirs.<sup>1</sup> This Roman custom is also mentioned at *Stichus* 251: 'iamne exta cocta sunt? quot agnis fecerat?' Both these are technical terms of Roman ritual.<sup>2</sup>

## JUDGEMENT

In *Capt.* 475, 476 Ergasilus is complaining of the stinginess and shamelessness of contemporary youth: 'ipsi de foro tam aperto capite ad lenones eunt quam in tribu sontes *aperto capite* condemnant reos.' Nowhere, as far as I can ascertain, has this judicial custom been explained. Yet it is clear that we are dealing here with a religious idea, common to both Greeks and Romans, which demanded that the heavenly gods should witness the passing of the sentence. Somewhat similar to the custom mentioned here by Plautus is the statement of Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.* iii. 426): 'das Tribunal kann nur aufgeschlagen werden unter freiem Himmel', although he adds: 'oder in einem, dem Publicum zugänglichen bedeckten Raum.' And so we read in the *lex latina tabulae Bantinae*:<sup>3</sup> 'i]ouranto apud quaestorem ad aerarium *palam luci*'.<sup>4</sup> The words *de foro* need not be a translation of the Greek *agora*. For the *comitia tributa* also mostly met on the Roman Forum, though apparently regularly only after 145 B.C.<sup>5</sup>

## JUNO

In *Amph.* 831 Alcumena's purgative oath seems to contain a large admixture of Roman conceptions. Her Juno is the *mater familias*, just as she is in *Cas.* 230: 'heia, mea Iuno, non decet esse te tam tristem tuo Iovi'.<sup>6</sup> Because of Alcumena's pregnancy the Juno invoked by her is probably at the same time Lucina. This would give us a natural explanation of 832: 'quam me vereri et metuere est par maxume.' It is true that Schuster (22, 23) believes that Juno is here substituted for Artemis. But according to Latte<sup>7</sup> this identification occurs in literature for the first time in Catullus. Against the assumption of a Greek character, it seems to me, we can also adduce the *verba sollemnina* character of the combination *vereri et metuere*; cf. *Amph.* 23, *Poen.* 269; also G. Koch, *Der roem. Jupiter*, 111.

Every woman had her Juno as every man had his Genius. In the light of this fact *Merc.* 689, 690: 'ut videas simul tuam Alcumenam paelicem, Iuno mea' receives its proper emphasis. True, it is only a bitter joke and possibly the Greek original had here Hera. But the *mea* is of importance. A similar view seems to be held by Fraenkel.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *RE*, ix. 1131; xviii. 613-18.

<sup>2</sup> Luebbert, *Comment. Pontif.* 124.

<sup>3</sup> Bruns, *Fontes*<sup>7</sup>, 55. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also *RE*, iv. 681; Usener, *Goetternamen*, 182.

<sup>5</sup> *RE*, iv. 705, 706.

<sup>6</sup> Fraenkel, 97 n. 3, 96, remarks on *Cas.* 408.

<sup>7</sup> *RE*, xiii. 1651.

<sup>8</sup> Fraenkel, 96, compares also *Pseud.* 1063; cf. *Truc.* 476: 'Lucinam meam' (*RE* xiii. 1648, 1649).

## JUPITER

The treatment of this god in the *Amphitruo* is particularly instructive. In the prologue he appears in 23 as specifically a god of the Romans, whom it is 'aequom vereri et metuere' (v. JUNO, above). In 91 he is specifically connected with the miracle of the *ludi Apollinares*, 202 B.C. (Livy xxx. 38, 10; xl. 34, 4). Before the battle the general makes vows to Jupiter (229, 230).<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Greek influence is felt in 27, where the god is humanized in that he 'formidat malum non minus quam vostrum quivis.' It is, I think, generally recognized that Plautus lived in the age when the process of transforming Roman gods into Greek was particularly active.<sup>2</sup> The view that mythology had penetrated Rome much earlier certainly does not hold good for the story of the *Amphitruo*; otherwise the long exposition 97 ff. would seem unnecessary. In this relation lines 104, 105 are particularly significant: 'nam ego vos novisse credo iam ut sit pater meus', etc., which can be apt only if the stories of the god's love affairs were at that time new and not generally familiar.<sup>3</sup>

In the same play at 739 a 'Jup. prodigialis' is to be invoked after a dream: 'postquam experrecta es, te prodigiali Iovi aut mola salsa hodie aut ture comprecata oportuit.' The custom of averting the threatened evil of a bad dream by prayer, libations, or incantations is well known.<sup>4</sup> It usually took the form of telling the dream to the rising sun. Our passage prescribes an offering of either sacrificial meal or incense. The use of the latter is understandable, since *suffimenta* are a regular part of apotropaic-cathartic rites.<sup>5</sup> It ought to be noted that this passage, whether of Greek or Roman origin, contradicts Pfister,<sup>6</sup> who sees in the use of pleasantly scented incense for the catharsis something specifically oriental, while in his opinion the Greeks preferred the use of evil-smelling ingredients. But for the use of *mola salsa* as a cathartic I cannot find any direct evidence. The passage from Lygdamus 4, 10: 'farre pio placant et saliente sale'<sup>7</sup> leaves open the possibility that flour and salt were offered separately.<sup>8</sup> The use of *mola salsa* in its Roman form is unknown to the Greeks and seems to point to a Roman belief. In the same direction, I believe, points the fact that Jupiter prodigialis is the god to be called on. I know, of course, that in Homer Zeus also sends baleful dreams. But, as far as I can find out, the Greeks did not connect him with incubation dreams,<sup>9</sup> while we have the testimony of Plautus, *Curc.* 266-9 for this side of the Capitoline god.<sup>10</sup> Because of this connexion of Jupiter with dreams I can see no reason why the epithet Prodigialis in the *Amph.* should be a translation of the Greek Terastios. It is true that *prodigialis* occurs in literature only in our passage and is unknown to inscriptions. But it is also true that Terastios occurs only in Lucian,<sup>11</sup> where perhaps it has crept in from comedy. Gulick (236, 1) believes that the god is here so called because he is particularly the source of omens, and that incense and meal point to a Greek original. He thinks it has the same meaning as ἀλεξίκακος and ἀποτρόπαιος. Against this it must be urged with Usener<sup>12</sup> that Terastios

<sup>1</sup> For the Roman character of this see Fraenkel, 349, and G. Besler, *Hermes*, xlv. 356: 'dem speziellen Schlachtauspicium mag ein spezielles Schlachtvotum staendig gefolgt sein.'

<sup>2</sup> Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia*, 33 n. 2, though he takes a different view in *Plaut. in Pl.* 91. There he claims that centuries before Livius Andronicus the Greek myths must have been known in Rome, under both Etruscan and Oscan influence. The antiquity of this familiarity is proved by the form of many mythological names. In this statement Altheim concurs (*Hist. Rom. Rel.* 24-45, 144-55).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also *RE*, 65.

<sup>4</sup> *RE*, xviii. 458.

<sup>5</sup> *RE*, i A. 284.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 268, 284.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 2094.

<sup>8</sup> *Saliente*, of the grains of salt jumping in the heat of the flame, while the *mola salsa* was a sort of porridge. Here, by the way, not Jupiter but Lucina is the deity invoked.

<sup>9</sup> *ML*, iii. 907-9.

<sup>10</sup> Accepted as authentic by Hopfner (*RE*, xiv. 1273). Latte (*ibid.* xviii, s.v. 'Orakel') omits its mention.

<sup>11</sup> *Dial. Deor.* 20, 11; *Tim.* 41.

<sup>12</sup> *Kl. Schr.* iv. 481 n. 38.



applies specifically to Zeus Keraunios. The epithet appears not suitable for the sender of dreams. It seems then that in spite of its uniqueness we shall have to accept the existence of a *Roman* Jupiter prodigialis.

## MARS

The passage *Truc.* 515: 'Mars peregre adveniēns salutāt Nerienem uxorem suam' is generally recognized as a valuable testimony for the relation of the two divinities.<sup>1</sup> The question is whether this matrimony was introduced under Greek influence or whether it is originally Roman. Altheim<sup>2</sup> still maintains against Wissowa and his followers that 'in its very early days the Roman people represented its deities to itself as fathers and mothers', and he also (200-6) assumes with Usener the existence, if not of Italic, certainly of Roman myths. Marbach<sup>3</sup> thinks of Greek models. But it seems to me that we must stress the *verba sollemnia* of line 516: 'quom tu recte provenisti quomque es aucta liberis.' For the religious meaning of *provenisti*, which Plautus uses at least with a 'double entendre', compare Tacitus, *Ann.* xvi. 2: 'nova ubertate provenire terram', where Draeger quotes our passage as a parallel.<sup>3</sup>

## DI MINUTI, MEDIOXUMI, PATELLARII.

*Minuti di* occur at *Cas.* 331, where the name is jokingly applied to the wife, son, and members of the household in contrast to the master of the home, who is likened to Jupiter. In the books on Roman religion this appellation is generally slighted and Schuster (56) says: 'e Plauti fabrica prodiisse puto.' Yet we have a passage in Callimachus, *Hymn* i. 72,<sup>4</sup> where the care for the plebs is assigned to the 'lesser gods', *di minores*, or to use the Plautine expression, *minuti*. However, it is questionable whether the Callimachus passage is based on a Greek conception, for, according to Wiedemann, in Egypt the common herd worshipped the lower gods rather than the great, just as they dared not approach the king except through underlings. Possibly then Callimachus borrowed his reference from the beliefs of the country in which he resided. In that case the *di minuti* need not have been borrowed by Plautus from the Greek original. On the other hand, they need not have been invented by the poet. In this connexion the passage *Cist.* 512 ff. gains in importance. Here we read of 'di deaeque superi, inferi, medioxumi'. Wissowa<sup>5</sup> considers the *medioxumi* a joke of the poet's which later interpreters mistakenly interpreted seriously. But in what could the joke lie? In 519 the speaker invokes Jupiter, Juno, and Janus (adding 'quid dicam nescio'), and in 522 he mentions 'di omnes, magni, minuti et etiam patellarii'. This last word is generally taken as a reference to the Penates.<sup>6</sup> The *et etiam* seems to indicate that the *patellarii* are even smaller than the *minuti*. It follows, I think, that we are dealing here with a real division of the gods into three classes. For that reason the *medioxumi*, too, ought to be taken seriously. Schuster's attempt to identify them with the *inferni* of Livy i. 32. 9 seems to me no better founded than their identification by Servius<sup>7</sup> with the *marini* (cf. Luebbert, *Comm. Pont.* 87). Compare also Martianus Capella ii. 154, of the gods of *secunda beatitas* (151): 'hos omnes Graeci daemones dicunt ἀπὸ τοῦ δαήμονας εἶναι, Latini Medioximos vocitarunt.'

## NENIA SORICINA

Even after the latest treatment<sup>8</sup> of *Bacch.* 889: 'te faciam confossiozem soricina

<sup>1</sup> Altheim, *RE*, xv. 1790 ff.; Marbach, *ibid.* xiii. 32 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Rom. Rel.* 240.

<sup>3</sup> See also W. Weber, *Der Prophet und sein Gott*, 108, 109. Fraenkel (32, 33) considers that the subject-matter is Roman. See also Knapp, *AJP*, xl. 252 (where Gellius xiii. 21, 11 should be

23, 12).

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Fehrle, *ML*, vi. 696: μακάρεσσιν ἀλλήλοισιν.

<sup>5</sup> *RK*, 38 n. 4; *ML*, iv. 433.

<sup>6</sup> *RE*, xix. 426, 428.

<sup>7</sup> *Ad Aen.* iii. 134.

<sup>8</sup> Heller, *TAPA*, lxx (1939), 357-67.

nenia', the meaning of this phrase still remains obscure.<sup>1</sup> Yet Heller was, I believe, on the right track, when he suspected that Plautus 'had slightly extended the meaning of the word in an obscene direction'. For I think that the solution may be found in the amatory sphere. The tool to be used in carrying out this threat is the roasting spit (*ueruina*), which is a euphemism for the *membrum virile*.<sup>2</sup> We know that the ancients often confused *sorex* and *mus* and so the explanation may perhaps be found in a fragment of Philemo (126 K.): 'like a white mouse, if somebody—but I am too bashful to say it—she screams so loud that one cannot help noticing it'. With this we may compare Aelian, *H.A.* xii. 10: 'the female is very eager for τὰ ἀφροδίσια.' Pliny xxx. 148 also points to the aphrodisiac sphere, when he says that if you castrate one shrew mouse, the others run away. Another, but less likely, explanation suggested itself to me through the statement (*RE* iii A. 1819) that a cattle murrain (Gasbrand) that causes many boils which break up and cause death was ascribed by the ancients to the bite of the shrew mouse. A colander would indeed have some resemblance to a surface covered with boils. In that case *nenia* would be the name of a perforated implement, comparable to the female parts. On such double entendre in Plautus compare L. Gurlitt, *Erotica Plautina*, 36.<sup>3</sup>

#### NURSERY RHYME

In *Men.* 805: 'male facit si istuc facit; si non facit tu male facis' I see either a sing-song verse to accompany some children's game or a travesty of it. It reminds me of the line in Horace, *Epist.* i. 1, 59, 60: 'rex eris, aiunt, si recte facies.' Possibly here also we are dealing with an obscene pun.<sup>4</sup>

#### PERSONIFICATIONS

Of this topic we possess the valuable treatment by Deubner,<sup>5</sup> Stössl, and Axtell. Yet their opinions differ in many details. Schuster (50, 51) considers personifications in general as genuinely Roman, but quotes what he believes to be clear exceptions to this statement. Thus on page 24 he declares *Bacch.* 113 ff. to be undoubtedly Greek. In this he is contradicted by Axtell (57), Fraenkel (290), and Stössl (1053). The last-named (presumably) sees in this passage 'a tendency to make fun of this Roman penchant'. This judgement, I think, is refuted by the fact that Amor, Venus, and probably Voluptas<sup>6</sup> are real Roman divinities. Mockery, it seems to me, is also excluded by the repeated alliterations,<sup>7</sup> for this device is deeply ingrained in Roman formulaic prayer.

#### PERJURY

The passage *Rud.* 1377: 'iubet iurare; tun meo pontifex peiurio es?' is, according to F. Marx in his commentary, the basic quotation for our information regarding the Roman view of perjury. He refers to Marquardt, *Staatsverw.* iii (1885), 257. The article of Latte in *RE* xv, s.v. 'Meineid' is silent on this, and the author of the article 'Sacramentum' in *RE* i A. 1673 says that we know of no punishment, either clerical or secular, for this offence. Yet as early as the year 1606 Hansen<sup>8</sup> calls the pontifex *periurii cognitor* and quotes our passage, and while Fredershausen in his *De Iure* 72 speaks only of a *nota censoria*, he adds 'haec cura a ceteris pontificum muneribus non

<sup>1</sup> Heller, l.c. 367.

<sup>2</sup> *Rud.* 1302: 'venenatumst verum: ita in manibus consenescit'; cf. Gurlitt, *Erotica*, 110.

<sup>3</sup> For the amorous character of the mouse see also Hopfner, *Wien. Stud.* xlv. 119, which Lackenbacher (ibid. 128) rejects. Cf. also Lesky, *ibid.* liv. 26; Stengel, *Hermes*, xlix. 92 n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> For *facere* in this sense see Georges' *Lexicon*,

i. 2667, No. 6.

<sup>5</sup> *ML*, iii, s.v. Stössl, *RE*, xix, s.v. H. L. Axtell, *The Personifications of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature*, diss. Chicago 1907.

<sup>6</sup> Axtell, l.c. 57; *ML*, vi. 371.

<sup>7</sup> Voluptas, Venus, Venustas; Sermo, Suavi-satiatio.

<sup>8</sup> Graevius, *Thes. Ant. Rom.* v, 807.

abhorret'.<sup>1</sup> From Cicero, *De Leg.* ii. 22 it appears that in his time the pontiff no longer exercised this function. It is thus clear that Plautus has here purposely introduced a feature of Roman sacred law.<sup>2</sup>

## PICNIC

In *Trin.* 478 ff. the parasite condemns moderateness at the table: 'nam ibi de divinis atque humanis cernitur.' This has been denominated 'a piece of pompous nonsense'.<sup>3</sup> It has also been called 'an exaggerated statement of value which makes a good meal as important as a session of the senate'.<sup>4</sup> I believe, however, that the passage has been taken from the Greek original; compare Alexis, *fg.* 77 K.: *ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς τραπέζης πλησίον.* The meal here referred to would be an Eranos, to which each participant brought his personal contribution.<sup>5</sup>

## PICUS

Fleckeisen's treatment of the passage *Aul.* 701:<sup>6</sup> 'Pis divitiis qui aureos montes colunt' seems to have met with universal approval.<sup>7</sup> Yet I see in it a number of difficulties, chief of which is the masculine gender, which Fleckeisen treats rather cavalierly,<sup>8</sup> although he can adduce no other example for it. Nor has anyone else succeeded in this. The fact that we meet occasionally a male Sphinx in Greek art of the seventh and sixth centuries can hardly be used as a proof for Plautus, who certainly knew word and animal only from literary sources. There is further objection to the form *pis* as either an accusative plu.—so Fl.—or a genitive sing.—so *RE* vii. 1922. For the accusative should be 'pices'.<sup>9</sup> I feel certain that our passage deals with a form of the noun *picus*. This bird was believed to know and use the herb paeonia to open anything closed. But in fairy tales this herb is used to unlock treasures as well. The only objection left is that *pis* is a dative, where one expects a direct object. To change it to 'pico' seems overbold. But it may be possible to adopt the reading *pici* of Nonius and to take it not as a genitive singular but as a proleptic nominative plural: 'qui . . . pici . . . incolunt'. However, this does not carry with it the necessity to accept the Nonian *eos* for *ego* in the next line.

## PRODIGIUM

The Roman character of the *prodigium* mentioned in the jesting passage *Bacch.* 1141 has long been recognized. But fragment 12 of the *Vidularia* has not been mentioned, though it very evidently has to do with the *procuratio* of a *prodigium* ('si vis annonam bonam') and the remedy proposed is the one customary in Roman procedure at the birth of a *monstrum*.<sup>10</sup>

## SPOLIA OPIMA

*Amph.* 252: 'ipsusque Amphitruo regem Pterelam sua optruncavit manu.' Wilamowitz<sup>11</sup> concluded from this passage that in the older form of the Taphian legend, used

<sup>1</sup> See also Luebbert, *Comment. Pontif.* 15.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also above s. 'Elements'.

<sup>3</sup> Freeman-Sloman, ad loc.

<sup>4</sup> Fairclough, ad loc. He thinks of the Roman *cena popularis*, probably wrongly.

<sup>5</sup> Ziebarth, *Griech. Vereinswesen*, 123, 124, 157, 196; Poland, *Das griechische Vereinswesen* (1909), 31-3, 258 ff., 392; Kutsch, *Alt. Heilgoetter* (RGVV, xii. 3) 15.

<sup>6</sup> *Neue Jb.* 143, 657 ff. It is really Ussing's; cf. 663.

<sup>7</sup> Fraenkel, 16 n. 1; *RE*, iii A. 1550, 1703; *ibid.*

4599-5

vii. 1922; Lodge, *Lex. Pl.* s.v. 'Pix'.

<sup>8</sup> 662: "the difference in gender cannot give offence."

<sup>9</sup> Sommer, *Handb. d. lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre*, 285. A cursory survey seems to show that Pl. always uses this termination in the acc. pl. of consonant stems.

<sup>10</sup> M. Delcourt, *Les stérilités mystérieuses*, etc. (1938), 52 ff., where our passage has been overlooked, as it has been, to my knowledge, in every treatment of this topic.

<sup>11</sup> *Herakles*<sup>2</sup>, ii, ad l. 1078.

by Euripides, Amphitryon killed Pterelaos in a duel, after he had destroyed Taphos. This hypothesis has been accepted by Escher<sup>1</sup> and is mentioned without objection by Robert<sup>2</sup> and Hofer.<sup>3</sup> But Wilamowitz has overlooked an important difference between Plautus<sup>4</sup> and the verses of Euripides, *Herakles* 1078 ff. Wilamowitz assumes that the duel took place after the conquest of the city of the Taphians and that this conquest had not yet freed Amphitryon of his blood-guilt. Plautus, on the other hand (258), places the surrender of the city on the day following the battle in which A. with his own hand (252) slew Pterelaos. Wilamowitz furthermore sees in the description of the battle 'eine Feldschlacht der Diadochenzeit', and thus believes he can gain a *terminus post quem* for the original of Plautus.<sup>5</sup> However, the value of this hypothesis is somewhat doubtful. It is clear, on the other hand, that for Plautus this deed of Amphitruo's is the climax of the battle, for he cannot find words enough to emphasize it (*ipsus, sua manu*). Possibly he actually found this feature in his original, for according to Theocritus (24, 5) Amphitryon ἀπεσκέλευσε the shield from the corpse of Pterelaos, but to him the importance lies in the fact that the leader of the Thebans slays the leader of the enemy. I think it very probable that the reason for this is to be found in the Roman custom of the *spolia opima*, which were offered by the victorious general when he had with his own hand slain the hostile leader, and it seems not too bold to believe that Plautus modified his original to work in this famous Roman custom.<sup>6</sup> A supporting parallel for my interpretation may be contained in lines 229, 230. Before the battle both generals make vows to Jupiter. For the purely Roman character of this feature see Fraenkel 349 and compare *Amph.* 947 and 966.

## VOLCANUS

In the passage *Epid.* 673 ff. I believe we can see a testimony to the original character of Volcanus as the destructive fire.<sup>7</sup> I agree with Wissowa in keeping this god separate both from the Cretan Velchanos and the Etruscan name of the same form. If Volcanus is purely destructive, it seems very unlikely that he should have been the god of a *gens*. In general, I think the *gens* theory of divine figures inverts the true relation; it is not the god who is named after the clan, but the clan which takes its name from the god. In this connexion the epithet *iratus* is particularly noteworthy, because, I think, it forms an intentional contrast to the epithets *quietus* and *mitis*.<sup>8</sup>

ERNST RIESS.

Formerly HUNTER COLLEGE,  
NEW YORK

<sup>1</sup> *RE*, i, s.v. 'Amphitryon'.

<sup>2</sup> *Heldensage*, ii, 611 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *ML*, iii, 3263.

<sup>4</sup> The only express mention of this duel; for Theocr. xxiv. 5 see below.

<sup>5</sup> He is followed by Sonnenburg (*RE*, xiv, 109).

<sup>6</sup> Only 21 years earlier Marcellus had won the distinction of the S.O.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *ML*, vi, s.v. 'Volcanus'; V. Duhn, *Ital. Gräberkunde*, i, 414-16.

<sup>8</sup> *ML*, vi, 361.

## MARGINALIA SCENICA. II

Eur. *Hel.* 1032 ff. ΕΛ. Μενέλαε, πρὸς μὲν παρθένου σεσώσμεθα.  
τοῦνθένδε δὴ σὲ τοὺς λόγους φέροντα χρή  
κοιὴν ξυνάπτειν μηχανὴν σωτηρίας.

If the text as given above is sound<sup>1</sup> (and it may possibly be so), then Helen effaces herself from the discussion which is to follow: σὲ is stressed, τοὺς λόγους is roughly equivalent to 'all that is to be said', and the simple φέροντα does duty for a compound like εἰσφέροντα. There is evidently a tinge of artificiality about this interpretation, and, if the unbroken usage of the tragedians counts, then τοὺς λόγους φέρειν should mean 'to bring the message', and no more: cf. e.g. *Ion* 1110 τίς προθυμία | ποδῶν ἔχει σε, καὶ λόγους τίνας φέρεις; *El.* 228 ἦκω φέρων σοὶ σοῦ κασιγνήτου λόγους, *Or.* 853 λόγους | ἀκουσον, οὗς σοὶ δυστυχεῖς ἦκω φέρων, *Soph. Trach.* 493 ὡς λόγων τ' ἐπιστολὰς φέρης, and so with φήμας or φήμην *Eur. Hel.* 1282, φάτιν *Soph. O.R.* 86, *Aesch. Ag.* 9, *Soph. Ai.* 826, μῦθον *O.C.* 357, and with various periphrases. For other senses a compound is called in (e.g. εἰσφέρειν *Bacch.* 650, *Andr.* 757, *Ion* 1340; προσφέρειν *I.A.* 97, *Ion* 1002), or a prepositional phrase is appended (e.g. εἰς ὧτα *Soph. Ai.* 149, or—what one expects here—εἰς μέσον *Eur. Tro.* 54). Hence, in this passage, the credibility of the tradition is not exactly enhanced by the fact that the difference between ΔΗCΕ and ΔΗCΕ̄—or, for that matter, ΔΕΙCΕ̄—is, to all intents and purposes, negligible. On the whole, it seems to me probable that Euripides wrote:

τοῦνθένδε δὴ 'ς ἐν (or δ' εἰς ἐν)\* τοὺς λόγους φέροντε\* χρή  
κοιὴν ξυνάπτειν μηχανὴν σωτηρίας.

The expression, at all events, is in his manner: cf. *H.F.* 489 ἐς ἐν δ' ἐνεγκοῦσ', *I.T.* 1016 συνθεῖς τὰδ' εἰς ἐν, *Or.* 1640 εἰς ἐν . . . συνήγαγον, *Phoen.* 462 ἐς ἐν ξυνελθῶν, *I.A.* 1127 εἰς ἐν ἦκετε, *Herac.* 402 εἰς ἐν ἀλίσας, *Ion* 1016 εἰς ἐν . . . κραθέντ', *Hel.* 742 εἰς ἐν ἐλθόντες (1535 is irreparably damaged). Slight misadventures through prodelision are frequent, the type being usually that of *El.* 856 κάρα γ' ἐπιδείξων = κάρα 'πιδείξων, *Cycl.* 617 μαινόμενος ἐξελέτω = μαινομένου 'ξελέτω, or *Hel.* 885 μῆτ' ἐλεγχθῇ = μῆ 'ξελεγχθῇ. At *I.T.* 298 παῖε σιδήρῳ λαγόνας εἰς πλευρὰς ἰεῖς, the proper remedy, I should have thought was not λαγόνας εἰς πλευρὰς <θ'> ἰεῖς (Reiske, vulg.), but

λαγόνας ἦ 'ς \* πλευρὰς ἰεῖς.

Compare, for example, *Aesch. S.c.T.* 208 ἀρα μὴ 'ς Μ, ἀρά μ' εἰς or ἀρά γ' εἰς *cell.*

*Hel.* 1589 ff. καὶ τις τόδ' εἶπε· Δόλιος ἡ ναυκληρία.  
πάλιν πλέωμεν ἀξίαν· κέλευε σύ,  
σὺ δὲ στρέφ' οἶακ'.

So L and P record the protest of the Egyptian sailors against being carried to Argolis. That I—ἀνθρωπος γόης καὶ πονηρός, ὃς οὐδ' ἂν ἄκων ἀληθὲς οὐδὲν εἴποι—thought to improve matters by writing πλέωμεν <N>αξίαν is irrelevant; and yet it may be doubted whether any one has done signally better. The proposal of Baynes and Henry Jackson—at first sight plausible, and, indeed, accepted by Murray—to write πλέωμεν· δεξιὰν κέλευε σύ ('you pipe to the right') is more than questionable. In the first place, the words κέλευε σύ, | σὺ δὲ στρέφ' οἶακ' hardly brook any addition; for their meaning—as even the tense of the imperatives helps to show—is surely: 'One of you act as boatswain (κελευστής); one, as steersman (οἰακοστροφός).' And again, what evidence is there that δεξιὰν ever meant 'to the right', or ἀριστεράν 'to

<sup>1</sup> Φέροντα has been altered by Musgrave into περῶντα, by Orelli into παρέντα, by Hartung into λέγοντα or προθέντα. Herwerden obelized, Vitelli suggested προσφέροντα χρή λόγους.



the left'? Badham's *πλέωμεν ἀντίαν* is probably unparalleled; and, were it paralleled, would yield only the futile tautology: 'Let us sail back in the adverse direction.' Dindorf's *ἀκτίαν* is imaginary, and Wecklein's appendix offers the constant reader an all too embarrassing choice between *ἐστίαν*, *νεανία*, *νόστιμον*, *νόστιμοι*, *ὀξέως*, *θάσσον οὖν*, *ὦ ξέν'* (with *ἐγκέλευε*), *ὦ ξένοι*, *ἄξιον*, *ἐξανείς*, *ὦ ξέν' ἄγε*, *ναυβάται*, *ναυβάταις*, *ἀλλ'* (or *εἰ')* *ἄναξ*, *ἀξιῶ* *'γκέλευε σύ*. The one oasis in the waste is Paley's: *τί νῦν πλέωμεν Ναυπλίαν*; *κέλευε σὺ κτέ*. The proposal, of course, is wild enough: yet, with a little more attention to technique, this mode of approaching the problem may, I fancy, be made to yield a reasonably satisfactory solution. Let the mutineers say, not: 'Why should we now sail to Nauplia?' but: 'Turn back! Why are we sailing to the Peloponnese?' and we have:

*Δόλιος ἢ ναυκληρία.  
πάλιν <τί> πλέομεν Ἀπίαν;\* κέλευε σύ,  
σὺ δὲ στρέφ' οὔακ'.*

The loss of *τι* before *π* involved the correction of *πάλιν πλέομεν* to *πάλιν πλέωμεν*, and the unfamiliar *ΑΠΙΑΝ* became *ΑΙΤΙΑΝ*, then travelled the downward road to *ἀξίαν* (see, for instance, Cobet *N.L.* p. 80). The ellipse of the imperative with *πάλιν* is too natural to be questioned; adequate parallels are: *Ar. Av.* 2 *ἦδε δ' αὖ κρώζει " Πάλιν "*, *Soph. El.* 1430 *ὦ παῖδες, οὐκ ἄφορον*; *O.C.* 178 *εἴτ' οὖν*; ('Any further?'), 192 *αὐτοῦ* ('Stop!'), *I.A.* 628 *πρὸς μητέρ'*, *Ἰφιδέμεια*, *Aesch. S.C.T.* 705 *νῦν ὅτε σοι παρέστακεν*, and the like. Such cases as *οἱ δ' οὐδέν' οὐ μὲν οὐδ' ἐγὼ τὰ πλείονα Rhes.* 778, *ὁ δ' οὐδέπω Ar. Thesm.* 846 (Blaydes), are perhaps irrelevant, and, in any event, are too common to deserve mention. The archaic and nebulous *Ἀπία* is, to my own feeling, by far the best word for 'Greece' that could be put into Egyptian mouths: the name, of course, is found at *Aesch. Suppl.* 117, 260, 777, *Ag.* 256, *Soph. O.C.* 1303; though not elsewhere in Euripides.

*Eur. Andr.* 1114 f. *τῷ δὲ ξιφήρης ἄρ' ὑφειστήκει λόχος  
δάφνη σκιασθεῖς κτέ.*

In 1114 it seems to me frivolous to write *ἄρ'*, whether the first culprit was Barnes or, as Wecklein asserts, the scribe of *E* (Murray's *A*). But, if so, it must be confessed that the alternative is not obvious at a first glance. Hermann and Paley thought of *ἀνθυφειστήκει*, Nauck of *κρύφιος εἰστήκει*: Murray quotes Verrall's curious *ξιφήρη σαρόν*, and himself proposes *ξιφήρη χεῖρ'*, but is content to obelize the line. He has so often and so happily applied Porson's maxim: *Tutissima corrigendi ratio est vocularum, si opus est, transpositio*, that one would almost have expected him to write, as personally I suspect Euripides did:<sup>1</sup>

*τῷ δὲ ξιφήρης λόχος ὑφειστήκειν ἄρα\*  
δάφνη σκιασθεῖς κτέ.*

The source of the mischief was naturally the inability of all transcribers, save one in a myriad, to recognize the third person in forms like *εἰστήκειν*. Out of the regiment of illustrations given by Cobet (*N.L.* pp. 215 ff.)—to whom Rutherford (*New Phryn.* pp. 229 ff.) adds nothing whatever—it is enough to quote *Ar. Vesp.* 635, where *ἦδεν* escapes through being taken for a first person: *ib.* 558, where it is converted into such by an unmetrical change of *ὄς* to *ὠς*: *Plut.* 696 (*Γν.* *ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὑμῖν οὐ προσήεν*; *Κα.* *οὐδέπω V+*) where *R* gives *προσῆι γ'*, others *προσῆι*: *Nub.* 1350 (*ὠς οὗτος, εἰ μὴ τῷ 'πεποιθεῖν—Dawes—οὐκ ἂν ἦν | οὕτως ἀκόλαστος*, where *R* has *πεποιθεῖ*, others *πέποιθεν* or *πέποιθ'*: *Av.* 1298 (*ἦκειν—Dawes—ὄρτυγι*), where 'infelix ἦκειν mirifice depravaverunt homunciones', among their misdeeds being *ἦκεν*, *ἦκεν*, and *ἦκεν*.—At *Ion* 1187 (*κοῦδεις τὰδ' ἦδε(ν)*. *ἐν χεροῖν ἔχοντι δὲ κτέ.*), it was considered adequate in view of the punctuation, to write *ἦδει*.

<sup>1</sup> This has been left as written, but I understand that the transposition (as also *κονίσας* at *Hel.* 1623) had occurred to Dr. Murray himself.

In two other passages of the *Andromache*, transposition provides a fair remedy for a corruption, at one place probable, at the other certain:

*Andr.* 649 ff.

διὰ γυναῖκα βάρβαρον,  
ἦν χρῆν σ' ἐλαύνειν τήνδ' ὑπὲρ Νείλου ῥοᾶς  
ὑπὲρ τε Φᾶσιν.

The τήνδ' of 650, is viewed, as might be expected, with a certain mistrust, but has a warranty of a sort in 708 ff.: εἰ μὴ φθερῇ τῆσδ' ὡς τάχιστ' ἀπὸ στέγης | καὶ παῖς ἄτεκνος, ἦν δ' γ' ἐξ ἡμῶν γεγώς | ἐλᾷ δι' οἰκῶν τήνδ' ἐπισπάσας κόμης. If, however, such things could be said, then it is miraculous that the highly convenient possibility of saying them should have left no deeper trace in Greek literature. Nor is there anything incredible in Musgrave's plain and commonly adopted conjecture: δι' οἰκῶν τῶνδ'. The corruption is anomalous, but not the best of scribes can be expected to err invariably *secundum artem*;¹ and the lapse can be paralleled half a dozen lines farther on (εἰ τίς με λύνει τῆσδε κωλύσει χέρας), where L, in defiance of the rules of the game, writes τήνδε. To object that τῆσδ' . . . ἀπὸ στέγης has just preceded, argues only an incorrigibly English or German ear. It remains none the less true that, if τήνδ' has to be altered in 650, it is by no means clear how it should be done. Reiske's τῆλ' is out of court, for the solitary appearance of the word in tragedy is in an Aeschylean tetrameter (*Pers.* 232); Wecklein's γῆν πρὸ γῆς, Νείλου ῥοᾶς κτέ. is foolhardy, and L. Dindorf's τῆν (after a discarded suggestion of Hermann's) introduces a totally inapposite phrase.² My own preference would go rather to:

διὰ γυναῖκα βάρβαρον  
τήνδ', ἦν ἐλαύνειν χρῆν σ'\* ὑπὲρ Νείλου ῥοᾶς  
ὑπὲρ τε Φᾶσιν.

At any rate, the enjambement with τήνδ' is characteristic: so, for instance, *supr.* 35 ναῖεν οἶκον ἀντ' αὐτῆς θέλω | τόνδ', 157 δόμους κατασχέιν ἐκβαλοῦσ' ἡμᾶς θέλεις | τοῦσδ', *Hērph.* 890 ἡμέραν δὲ μὴ φύγοι | τήνδ', *Trō.* 33 ὑπὸ στέγαις | ταῖσδ', 1137 χαλκόνωντον ἀσπίδα | τήνδ', 1271 μεθήκουσιν σ' Ὀδυσσεύς πάρα | οἷδ', *Ion* 79 Λοξίου γόνον | τόνδ', 421 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ | τῆδ', *Phoen.* 6 γῆν | τήνδ', 941 ἐκ γένους δὲ δεῖ θανεῖν | τοῦδ', *El.* 1134 ὅταν πράξω χάριν | τήνδ'—and so constantly. The scribe presumably opened with ἦν χρῆν through some chance recollection of the line (607) which he had written on the preceding page: ἦν χρῆν σ' ἀποπτύσαντα μὴ κινεῖν δόρυ, then noticed his lapse, and, with proper pride in the appearance of his copy, avoided erasure by adjusting the position of σ(ε), τήνδ', and ἐλαύνειν.

*Andr.* 230 f.

τῶν κακῶν γὰρ μητέρων  
φεύγειν τρόπους χρὴ τέκνα οἷς ἔνεστι νοῦς.

So MBO: the remaining manuscripts have τέκν' οἷς, Stobaeus τέκν' αἷς. The industrious L changed τέκν' οἷς into τέκν' <ὄς>οις, precisely as—had he been operating on the text of M—he would have changed τέκνα οἷς into τέκνα γ' οἷς, a measure which was to be

¹ If a reason has to be assigned for everything, it is perfectly possible that, in 710, ἦν is merely the echo of ἦν: for these subconscious repetitions or anticipations of a letter, a syllable, or a word, written, read, or floating in the transcriber's mind are found everywhere.

² It may be restored, ὁδοῦ πάρεργον, at Ps.-Liban. *Parasiti de domino philosophante querella* § 2 (Förster, t. vi. 594, 2):

ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τις δαίμων πονηρὸς ἐβάσκηνέ μοι τῆς τροφῆς καὶ παρεῖλετό μου τὴν ἀφορμὴν τοῦ βίου . . . , ἐπὶ τὸ κύνειόν μοι βαδιστέον, διότι τὴν ἐπὶ δειπνον οὐδεὶς ἡγεῖται.

πονηρὸς ἐβάσκη\*: που προσεβάσκη (a non-existent compound) codd., edd. || τὴν *La Ma* (a distinct family): τῶν cett., edd. || ἐπὶ\*: περί codd., edd.

For δαίμων πονηρὸς, cf. *Invidi se deferentis or.* (Förster, vi. 637, 15) πονηρῷ συμπλέγμαι δαίμονι (presumably from comedy), Plut. *Crass.* 22 τίς σε δαίμων πονηρὸς, ὃ κάκιστε ἀνθρώπων, ἡγάγε πρὸς ἡμᾶς; *Alex.* 30 οὐδὲν ἔχεις αἰτιάσασθαι τὸν πονηρὸν δαίμονα, Procop. t. iii. 118, 7 Hauray τῇ τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος τῆδε παρουσίᾳ, Ach. Tat. vii. 2 fin. πονηρῷ περιπεσεῖν δαίμονι—with many other places.

applied later by Barnes. <"Οσ>οις certainly holds rather more than its own against Lenting's τέκνα τοῖς, Nauck's τέκν' ὅτοις (for which he rejected his earlier παῖδας αἰς) or O. Hense's παῖδας οἰς. The line, however, may be no more than the sad consequence of starting out to write a verse without checking one's memory by the copy; and, given the seven words of that verse, they arrange themselves automatically:

νοῦς οἷς ἔνεστι, χρῆ τρόπους φεύγειν τέκνα.\*

The same features are unmistakable at

I.A. 515.

Με. οὐκ, ἦν νιν εἰς "Αργος ἀποστελεῖς πάλιν.

Markland, followed by the editors, altered ἀποστελεῖς into ἀποστείλεις, P<sup>2</sup> having suggested εἰ νιν: L<sup>2</sup> and P<sup>2</sup> prolong the second syllable of "Αργος by adding γ' and for once the interpolation is not absurd. It leaves, however, a verse which is surprising in Euripides, and which Kirchhoff sought to improve with: οὐκ, ἦν νιν "Αργος ἐξαποστείλεις πάλιν. But ἐξαποστελλω, though familiar enough later, especially in Polybius, makes its first recorded appearance in the Macedonian age. Murray's εἰσαποστείλεις is cited by Liddell and Scott only from Antoninus Liberalis and the Flinders Petrie papyri; and it may be doubted whether it has any closer point of contact with Euripides than its presence in the first argument to the *Orestes*. My own suggestion has, I find, been anticipated by Bothe. The coincidence in itself may not be impressive, but it still seems to me likely that Menelaus said, with a hepthemimeral caesura:

οὐκ, ἦν ἀποστείλεις νιν εἰς "Αργος πάλιν.

How Bothe supported his emendation, if at all, I do not know: certainly it is Euripidean. For the heavy rhythm compare, for example, ἴν' ἀνταλώσω μὲν *Or.* 1165, ἀλλ' ἐξίχνεύσουσιν σε *Bacch.* 817, σφάζαι κελεύουσιν με *Heracl.* 408, μάλιστα δ' Εὐρυσεύς σε *ib.* 456, οἷδ' οὐ προδώσουσιν σε *ib.* 715, and, with εἰς "Αργος for the following molossus, *ib.* 98 τῶν σῶν ἀποσπασθέντες εἰς "Αργος μολεῖν.

Exactly similar is:

Soph. *Phil.* 559 f.

φράσον δ' ἄπερ ἔλεξας, ὥς μάθω τί μοι  
νεώτερον βούλευμ' ἀπ' Ἀργείων ἔχεις.

So the distich is read by L and others: according to A and a fifteenth-century Venice manuscript (Pearson's *Ven c*), Sophocles—εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ καὶ δεξιός, | πολλὰς ποιήσας καὶ καλὰς τραγωδίας—ingeniously avoided a pyrrhic in the second foot by writing ἄπερ γ', and in the editions ἄπερ γ' usually stands. But, before accepting the gift of 'A Ven c', it may be advisable to glance at their other contributions to the metrical exactitude of the *Philoctetes*. If I may trust my memory and a rapid scrutiny of Pearson's apparatus, they are these: *Phil.* 655 ταῦτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλ' ἔσθ' ἃ βασιλεύω χερσίν. So L<sup>+</sup> (οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλ' ἃ Hartung, *alii alia*). The remedy of A *Ven c* is ἄλλα γ'.—1003 ξυλλάβετ' αὐτόν· μὴ 'πὶ τῷδ' ἔστω τόδε. So L<sup>+</sup> (ξυλλάβετον Bernhardt: cf. *O.C.* 219 μακρὰ μέλλετ', ἀλλὰ ταχύνετε = μακρὰ μέλλετον, ἀλλὰ τάχυνε). The remedy of A *Ven c* is ξυλλάβετέ γ'.—933 πρὸς θεῶν πατρῶων, τὸν βίον μὴ μ' ἀφέλεις. So L<sup>+</sup> (μὴ ἀφέλη Elmsley after *ed. Lond.*<sup>2</sup>). The remedy of A *Ven c* is μὴ μου 'φέλεις.—1469 χωρῶμεν ἤδη (as the beginning of an anapaestic dimeter). So L<sup>+</sup> (δὴ *Par.* 2711 *supra lin.*, *edd.*). The remedy of A *Ven c* is ἰδοῦ.—And as *Ven c* may be fairly presumed to be, in the majority of cases, one of the manuscripts comprised under Pearson's wider symbol A *rec*, we have further: 251 οὐδ' ὄνομ' οὐδὲ τῶν ἐμῶν κακῶν κλέος. So L<sup>+</sup> (ὄνομ' <ἄρ>) Erfurdt: οὐνομ' A<sup>+</sup>.—736 f. ἰὼ θεοί· | Νε. τί τοὺς θεοὺς ἀναστένων καλεῖς; So L<sup>+</sup> (ὦ θεοί. Νε. τί τοὺς θεοὺς <ὦδ>) ἀναστένων καλεῖς anon., Seidler; but the original is uncertain): <οὔτως> ἀναστένων A<sup>+</sup>, with twelve syllables but no caesura.—1037

ἐξοιδ  
Lb: d  
etc.)  
'Ατρ  
rema  
corre  
the g  
ματα  
μόνη  
πρὸς  
Porsc  
δύσμο  
ἔσσομ  
τέλη  
excell  
corre  
in a l  
rising  
ticken  
H

The c  
μοι μ  
οὔτος  
γνώμ  
τῷδ'  
S. EL  
A

Cante  
dochr  
own a  
necess  
Senku  
iambi  
Sie fir  
ὁ Διόν  
1 Ec  
Brunch  
δὲ λευ  
σπαρέν  
λευκόν  
αἵματος  
as Ath  
timeles  
instanc  
Heros  
(= ἀρρ  
mowitz  
2 Th  
ὦ παῖ

ἐξοῖδα δ' κτέ. So L<sup>+</sup>. In some exemplar this had shrunk to ἐξοῖδ', as it has in Pearson's Lb: ἐξοῖδ' γ' A<sup>+</sup>.—1381 ἀ σοὶ τε καὶ μοι καλῶς ὁρῶ τελοῦμενα. So L<sup>+</sup> (ἀφ' ὅθ' ὁρῶ Dind., etc.): καλ' ὁρῶ A<sup>+</sup>.—1390 ἐγὼ γ' οὐκ Ἀτρεΐδας κτέ. So L<sup>+</sup> by a stereotyped error (ἐγὼ οὐκ Ἀτρεΐδας Hermann, etc.): ἐγὼ γ' Ἀτρεΐδας A<sup>+</sup>. In the other plays the picture remains unaltered—in L a gross metrical corruption; in A and its *asseclae*, an infantile correction, never a reading which carries the seal of truth on its forehead or explains the genesis of the error. Typical instances are: O.C. 1199 ἔχεις γὰρ οὐχὶ βίαυα τάνθυμματα L] οὐχὶ βαιά Musgrave: οὐ βίαυα A<sup>+</sup>.—Ant. 887 ἀφεῖτε μόνην ἔρημον L] ἀφετε Vat.: μόνην ἀφῆτ' A Ven c.—1037 ἐμπολάτε τὰ πρὸ Σάρδεων | ἡλεκτρον L] τὰπὸ Blaydes: τὸν πρὸς A<sup>+</sup>.—Ai. 534 πρέπον γέ τ' ἂν ἦν δαίμονος τοῦμοῦ (τ' ἐμοῦ Blaydes) τότε L] γε τὰν ἦν Porson: γέ τ' ἦν ἂν A<sup>+</sup>.—O.C. 327 ὦ πάτερ, δύσμορ' ὁρᾶν L] δύσμορ(φ) Buecheler: δύσμοιρ' (non-existent) A Ven c.—El. 818 ξύνοικος ἔσομ' L ante corr.] εἴσομ' Hermann: ἔσομ' A<sup>+</sup> L corr.—Trach. 7 ναῖουσ' ἐν Πλευρώνι L] <ἐτ'> ἐν Erfurdt: ἐνὶ A<sup>+</sup>.—Ant. 1241 τέλη λαχὼν δειλῆαιος ἐν Ἀίδου δόμοις L] Ἀίδου λαχὼν δειλῆαιος ἐν δόμοις τέλη Nauck excellently,<sup>1</sup> though to deaf ears: εἰν Ἀίδου A<sup>+</sup>.—In fact, to accept a metrical correction from A, alone or with the humble support of Ven c and its peers, is to engage in a lottery; and the editor who succumbs to the temptation ought to do so with the rising blush and the severely chastened hope with which he would take any other ticket in any other sweepstake.

Here, then, I should retain every letter of the tradition and write:

ἄπερ δ' ἔλεξας, ὡς μάθω, φράσον· τί μοι  
νεώτερον βούλευμ' ἀπ' Ἀργείων ἔχεις;

The cast of the sentence is now forcible and idiomatic, as above at 332 οἱμοι· φράσῃς μοι μὴ πέρα, πρὶν ἂν μάθω | πρῶτον τόδ'· ἡ τέθνηχ' ὁ Πηλέως γόνος; or at Ar. Av. 270 οὗτος αὐτὸς νῶν φράσει· τίς ἐστὶν ὄρνις οὗτοσί; or Eur. Tro. 899 ὁμῶς δ' ἐρέσθαι βούλομαι· γινώμει τίνες | Ἑλλήσι καὶ σοὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς πέρι; or ib. 945 οὐ σ' ἄλλ' ἐμαυτὴν τοῦπὶ τῷδ' ἐρήσομαι· | τί δὴ φρονοῦσα κτέ. That it was once debated how to punctuate S. El. 316 ὡς νῦν ἀπόντος ἰστέροι· τί σοι φίλον; is amazing.

At H.F. 1023 f., the accepted transposition is a palliative only. The lines are:

σὺ δὲ τέκνα τρίγωνα τεκόμενος, ὦ δαῖς,  
λυσσάδι συγκατεργάσω μοῖρα.

Canter was, of course, adequate to the task of changing δαῖς to δαίε, but the limping dochmii are more troublesome, and Wecklein is cheerless.<sup>2</sup> Wilamowitz printed his own arrangement: τρίγον', ὦ δαίε, τεκόμενος κτέ., and denied that anything else was necessary—'7 δ', he comments on 1022–4, 'der letzte mit Unterdrückung der letzten Senkung. Diese Erscheinung ist eigentlich eine Anomalie, denn sie ist aus den iambischen Liedern und ihren Verwandten in dieses Rhythmengeschlecht übertragen. Sie findet sich aber mehrfach, z. B. Ion 1494 ἀνὰ δ' ἄντρον ἔρημον οἰωνῶν, Bakch. 1037 ὁ Διώνυσος ὁ Διὸς οὐ Θῆβαι, Hel. 657 ἀδόκητον ἔχω σε πρὸς στέρνους.' The layman might

<sup>1</sup> Equally excellently and equally in vain Brunck reduced to sanity Trach. 781 f. κόμης δὲ λευκὸν μυελὸν ἐκράνει, μέσου κρατὸς διασπαρέντος αἱματός θ' ὁμοῦ by writing: κρατὸς δὲ λευκὸν μυελὸν ἐκράνει μέσου, | διασπαρέντος αἱματος κόμης θ' ὁμοῦ. That the vulgate is as old as Athenaeus is nothing; for such errors are timeless. The Cairo papyrus of Menander, for instance, begins the metrical argument of the *Heros* with: ἄρρεν τεκοῦσα παρθένος θῆλύ θ' ἄμα (= ἄρρεν τε θῆλύ θ' ἄμα τεκοῦσα παρθένος Wilamowitz).

<sup>2</sup> The *conjecturae minus probabiles* are: '1023 ὦ παῖ Διὸς Barnes, ὦ τάλας Elmsley, ὡς δαῖς

Bothe, ἔθλιε Fix, οὐ δαῖς Kirchhoff, ὦ τάλας Dindorf, δαμῆς Kayser 1023 f. σὺ δὲ . . . τεκόμενος ἐλέκεις . . . συγκατεργασάμενος μοῖρα vel σὲ δὲ . . . τεκόμενον πάλιν λυσσάδι συγκατεργάσασθαι μοῖρα Paley 1024 νῦν μοῖρα Fix, σὴ μοῖρα Kirchhoff, σὸν ὁρμᾶ F. W. Schmidt, μοι ῥιπᾶ vel μαχανᾶ Wecklein (olim), δὴ μοῖρα J. H. H. Schmidt.' Under his text, unquestionably against the grain, he records Wilamowitz's transposition, and for μοῖρα proposes an impossible *μωρία*. Dr. Murray follows Wilamowitz, and quotes Kirchhoff's (σὴ) μοῖρα, which apparently by a slip he attributes to Bruhn.





lines is common: in the dramatists, the two best emendations based on the hypothesis are, perhaps, one—universally accepted—by Meineke in *Mach* fr. 2 *ap.* *Ath.* 346 A (πάλιν γένου σύ, μέχρι ἂν ἡδὺς ᾖ· | ὥσπερ λύραν ἐπίτευ', ἔως ἂν ἀρμόσῃ for πάλιν γένου· συμμετρίαν ἀρμόσῃ· | ὥσπερ λύραν ἐπίτευται· ὡς ἡδὺς εἶ) and one—universally neglected—by Badham in *Ar. Plut.* 119 f. (ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν οὖν οἶδ' ὡς ἂν ἐπιτρίψει μ' εἰ | πύθουτο τοῦτ'. *Xp.* ὦ μῶρε, νῦν δ' οὐ τοῦτο δρᾷ; for ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν οὖν εἰδὼς—οἶδ' ὡς al.—τὰ τούτων μῶρ' ἔμ' εἰ | πύθουτ' ἂν ἐπιτρίψει. *Xp.* νῦν δ' οὐ τοῦτο δρᾷ;). At *I. A.* 841 ff. the vulgate is to me unintelligible, and I should write without much scruple:

*Ax.* οὐπώποτ' ἐμνήστευσα παῖδα σὴν, γύναι,  
οὐδ' ἐξ' Ἀτρειδῶν ἡλθέ μοι λόγος γάμων.  
*Kl.* τί δῆτ' ἂν εἴῃ; σὺ πάλιν αὖ λόγους ἐμούς  
εἵκαζ'. ἐμοὶ γὰρ θαύματ' ἐστὶ τὰ παρὰ σοῦ.  
*Ax.* θαύμαζε· κοινὸν <δ'> ἐστὶν εἰκάζειν τάδε·

ἀμφὺ γὰρ ἐψευδόμεθα τοῖς λόγοις ἴσως.  
844 f. εἵκαζ' . . . θαύμαζε· κοινὸν δ' \*: θαύμαζ' . . . εἵκαζε·  
κοινὸν || τὰ παρὰ] τὰπὸ Dobree || 846. ἐψευδόμεθα *apogr.*  
*Par.*: οὐ ψευδόμεθα LP, οὖν ψ. *Matthiae.*

At *Soph. Trach.* 863 ff., I am tempted, though the temptation should, perhaps, be resisted, by

*Hm. α'.* πότερον ἐγὼ μάταιος, ἢ κλύω τινὸς  
οἴκτου, δι' οἴκων ἀρτίως ὀρμωμένου;  
τί φημί;  
*Hm. β'.* ἤχει τις οὐκ ἄσσημον ἀλλὰ νῦν στέγης  
κωκυτὸν εἶσω, καὶ τι καινίζει τύχη.

866 f. ἀλλὰ νῦν στέγης . . . τύχη\*: ἀλλὰ δυστυχῇ . . . στέγη.

The dittography of the *ω* in *συγκατειργάσω* calls for no comment. On the other hand, haplography of the letter may possibly have been the source of the mischief at *Phoen.* 1604 ff.:

Ταρτάρου γὰρ ὤφελεν  
ἐλθεῖν Κιθαριῶν εἰς ἄβυσσα χάσματα,  
ὅς μ' οὐ διώλεσ', ἀλλὰ δουλεῦσαι τέ μοι  
δαίμων ἔδωκε Πόλυβον ἀμφὶ δεσπότην.

'1606 f. δουλεύουσά τοι πρὸς Πόλυβον ἐξέδωκεν Valckenaer, δουλεῦσαι μέ τοι δρυμῶν ἔδωκε Musgrave, δουλεύουσά με Μοῖρ' ἐξέδωκε Porson, δουλεῦσαι μέ τοι παῖδ' ἐξέδωκε anonymous, δουλεῦσαι τέ με τύραννον ἐξέδωκεν ἀμφὶ (et 1608 κτανών τ') Elmsley, δουλεῦσαι (τί μοι δαίμων;) ἔδωκε Bothe—so Wecklein's record opens, and on the same high note of courage it will be found to close. In Kirchhoff, the tortured lines stand at the foot of the page in Weidmann's smallest minuscules. But iambic trimeters do not, as Wolf said of the Mosaic 'interpolation' in the *Περὶ ὕψους*, drop from heaven; and, if these had their origin on earth, who invented them? and why? and in what sense did he believe his muse to have spoken? In Dr. Murray's edition, eleven dots divide ἀλλὰ from δουλεῦσαι, and this expedient may be the best available. Yet I fail to see how it is recommended by the scholia, to which he appeals, nor am I altogether convinced that is necessary. If nothing is lost, then Porson's ἀλλὰ δουλεύουσά με practically imposes itself; but, in that case, since Oedipus was brought up as the son and heir of Polybus, the project showed a want of prescience little to the credit of a daemon, but natural in the soft-hearted slave who made over the child to his acquaintance the Corinthian herdsman. It seems to me well within the bounds of the possible that he perished in the accident ΔΜΩΝ, and that Oedipus said

ὅς τ' οὐ διώλεσ' ἀλλὰ δουλεύουσά με  
δμ(ώ)ων\* ἔδωκε Πόλυβον ἀμφὶ δεσπότην

precisely as on a distant day he had said *ἄλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν ὁς ἀγρίας πέδας* | . . . *ἔλυσ' ἀπὸ τε φόνου* | *ἔρρυτο κἀνέσωσέ μ'* (*O.T.* 1349 ff.).

*Ion* 279 f.

*Ιω.* σὺ δ' ἐξεσώθης πῶς κασιγνήτων μόνῃ;

*Κρ.* βρέφος νεογνὸν μητρὸς ἦν ἐν ἀγκάλας.

The old controversy as to *ῆ* and *ῆν* in the first person has flickered out in a gentlemen's agreement, to print, in deference to the ancient grammarians, *ῆ[ν]* in the multitude of cases where the word precedes a consonant, and to print, in deference to the ancient transcribers, *ῆν* in the handful of cases where it precedes a vowel. This policy of appeasement in a question of small interest and no importance is eminently reasonable, but attains only a *modus vivendi*. Two facts cannot be seriously disputed: first, that *ῆ* has been systematically eliminated from our manuscripts, and, where it survives, has survived by the skin of its teeth; second, that, till the dawn of the Middle Comedy, *ῆν*—if in vogue—was, despite its great metrical convenience, avoided by the dramatic poets. Whether that avoidance was complete or not, is a secret which has gone with the old world to the grave: all that can be done, if anything is worth doing at all, is to scrutinize the faces of the witnesses, and to suspend judgement. Their veracity cannot be established, nor their mendacity be confuted; appearances may tell for or against them, but appearances are known to be deceptive. To ask that every passage in which *ῆν* is metrically guaranteed should be of clear authenticity, should be linguistically above suspicion, and should offer a fairly stubborn resistance to the emending sceptic, would be to demand too much from a providence which has many other calls upon its time; but it might be fairly expected that one passage in half a dozen would satisfy all three conditions. Whether that is so, is questionable. At *I.A.* 944, for instance, the line *ἐγὼ κάκιστος ῆν ἄρ' Ἀργεῖων ἀνὴρ* meets certainly the second requirement, and, so far as I can see, the third; but it is unfortunate, to say the least, that it should occur in one of the most widely doubted speeches of a composite play in which it is usually impossible to disengage the Euripidean elements from the non-Euripidean: the passage, in fact, is not evidence for the form—the form is evidence against the passage.—Again, something is surely out of joint at *Hel.* 988 ff.: *οὐ γὰρ γαμῆϊ τῖνδ' οὔτε σὺγγονος σέθεν* | *οὐτ' ἄλλος οὐδεὶς· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σφ' ἀπάξομαι*, | *εἰ μὴ πρὸς οἴκους δυνάμεθ'*, ἀλλὰ πρὸς νεκρούς. | *τί ταῦτα; δακρύοις ἐς τὸ θῆλυ τρεπόμενος* | *ἐλενὸς ῆν ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ δραστήριος*. | *κτεῖν'*, εἰ δοκεῖ σοι· *δυσκλεῶς γὰρ οὐ (οὖν Reiske) κτενεῖς*· | *μᾶλλον γε μέντοι τοῖς ἐμοῖς πείθου (πιθοῦ Dindorf) λόγοις*, | *ἴν' ἥς δικάια καὶ δάμαρτ' ἐγὼ λάβω*.<sup>1</sup> Even a man like Scaliger, to whom *ῆν* was the only form known, could make nothing of *ῆν ἂν*; nor has any interpretation been given which satisfies at once Greek usage, the demands of the context, and the canons of common sense—for Pearson's note is grounded on a pure fallacy.—At *Alc.* 655 *παῖς δ' ῆν ἐγὼ σοι τῶνδε διάδοχος δόμων*, all is in order, and, had not *σοι* been spelt with a sigma, the line would have carried weight: as it is,

<sup>1</sup> Schenkl, Herwerden, and Wecklein cancel 991–5; but, apart from 992, everything is either Euripides or an imitation perfect to the last detail. If the knife has to be used, it should be only on the sick member. The difference between *τρεπόμενος* and *τρεπόμεθα* is simply that between *τρεπόμε* and *τρεπόμε*—sometimes not so much: for, as Bast pointed out, circumstances arise in which the superscribed symbols become identical. The reader, who thought he saw before him: *τί ταῦτα; δακρύοις ἐς τὸ θῆλυ τρεπόμενος* | *κτεῖν'*, εἰ δοκεῖ σοι *κτέ*, is not to be censured for setting matters right to the best of his ability. None the less, he would have done better with: *τί ταῦτα; δακρύοις*

*ἐς τὸ θῆλυ τρεπόμεθα\**· | *κτεῖν'*, εἰ δοκεῖ σοι *κτέ*. The connexion of thought is clear, or would be so on the stage. When Menelaus, in the heat of his oratory, comes to that chilling disyllable *νεκρούς*, his voice falters a trifle and, to brush away the involuntary tear, he lifts his hand, as he was to lift it later, if the scholiast does not lie, at the chilling trisyllable *ἀπόδος* (*Or.* 643). Then comes the recollection that he is the son of Atreus, the sacker of Troy, *Μενέλαος οὐκ ἄγνωστος ἐν πάσῃ χθονί*, as he announces himself at 504 above, and he rises to the typical bravado: *κτεῖν'*, εἰ δοκεῖ σοι, followed by the typical relapse into the better part of valour: *μᾶλλον γε μέντοι τοῖς ἐμοῖς πιθοῦ λόγοις*.

Nauck  
outse  
phanes  
a pause  
that in  
be see  
certain  
but ag  
ad abs  
have ch  
them t  
the pre  
καὶ σφ  
ἀρ' ἐφ  
ἀρ' ἔστ  
ὑμῖν δο  
read in  
at the  
append  
there i  
emend

Paralle  
one pie  
κακοῖσι

The we  
but int  
ingenue  
the alt  
person  
rate cl  
since th  
If, ther  
ἢ οὐδε  
must b

For th  
easily

<sup>1</sup> Her  
land (th  
scholiast  
rest, W  
Murray  
tonio':  
nothing  
crepanci  
may be  
were Ki  
the sha  
<sup>2</sup> Cer

Nauck's  $\eta$  γεγώ(σ) σοι is disconcerting. In addition, this question arises: If, at the outset of his career, in a play exactly half a century anterior to the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, in which  $\eta\eta$  makes its first uncontroverted appearance (though always with a pause before the following vowel), Euripides had no objection to  $\eta\eta$  ἐγώ, is it probable that in three myriads of extant verses written subsequently that useful cretic would be seen no more?—At *Hipp.* 1012, the genuine tradition appears to have been certainly: μάταιος ἀρ'  $\eta\eta$ , οὐδαμοῦ μὲν οὖν φρενῶν.<sup>1</sup> To it no exception can be taken, but again a question suggests itself: If Euripides had decided to clinch his *reductio ad absurdum* of Theseus' arguments by the seven words of the text, why should he have checked,<sup>2</sup> and then discarded, his first impulse, which must have been to arrange them thus: ἀρ'  $\eta$  μάταιος; οὐδαμοῦ μὲν οὖν φρενῶν (Halbertsma)? Take, for example, the precisely analogous cases at *Alc.* 771 ἀρα τὸν ξένον | στυγῶ δικάως; ib. 228 ἀρ' ἄξια καὶ σφαγᾶς τάδε . . .; *Tro.* 935 ἀρ' ἠτύχησεν Ἑλλάς, ὠλόμην δ' ἐγώ . . .;<sup>3</sup> *Soph. O.T.* 822 ἀρ' ἔφυν κακός; *O.C.* 753 ἀρ' ἀθλιον τοῦνιδος . . .; *Trach.* 988 ἀρ' ἐξήδη σ' . . .;<sup>4</sup> *Al.* 277 ἀρ' ἔστι ταῦτα δις τόσ' ἐξ ἀπλῶν κακά; *El.* 614 ἀρά σοι δοκεῖ . . .; *Aesch. P.V.* 735 ἀρ' ὑμῖν δοκεῖ . . .; *Ar. Av.* 797 ἀρ' ὑπόπτερον γενέσθαι παντός ἐστιν ἄξιον; Such passages, read in their contexts, do far more than show that Halbertsma's correction deserves, at the least, more prominence than falls to its lot in a sequestered nook of Wecklein's appendix.—Of the line from the *Ion*, which figures at the head of this paragraph, there is little to say. If it requires emendation, then, in my own view, it must be emended thus:

ἐν ἀγκάλαις νεογνὸν  $\eta$  μητρὸς βρέφος.\*

Parallels for the trajectory can be cited by the dozen: all are idle, however, unless one piece of evidence crumbles. At *H.F.* 1415, Hercules asks: σὺ ποῖος ἦσθα νέρθεν ἐν κακοῖσιν ὤν; and Theseus answers:

ὥς ἐς τὸ λῆμα παντός  $\eta\eta$  ἦσσαν ἀνὴρ.

The words have been regarded as decisive of the whole problem—wrongly, I fancy, but intelligibly. For, on the one hand, the line is necessary; and, on the other, mortal ingenuity cannot by methods on this side of insanity change  $\eta\eta$  to  $\eta$ . But there is the alternative. If  $\eta\eta$  is not mutable and, to beg the question, cannot be the first person, then  $\eta\eta$  is immutable and is the third person. The situation is then at any rate clarified: ἀνὴρ is no longer a predicate but a subject in search of a predicate, and, since there is nothing else which can be that predicate, it lies in the six letters παντός. If, then, those letters refuse to yield a word meaning either οὐδείς or, at worst,  $\eta$  τις ἢ οὐδείς, a verdict must be recorded against Elmsley; if they do yield it, the verdict must be open. And open I should leave it at the expense of writing:

ὥς ἐς τὸ λῆμα σπάνιος\*  $\eta\eta$  ἦσσαν ἀνὴρ.

For the western or north-western loop which, added to  $\omega$ , converts it into  $\omega$ , is easily and often overlooked, or, on occasion added: so πείραις for σπείραις *Ion* 1164,

<sup>1</sup> Here φρενῶν is a clear emendation by Markland (the manuscripts have φρονῶν, but the scholiast renders: οὐδαμοῦ συνέσεως  $\eta\eta$ ). In the rest, Wecklein states that L has κοῦδαμοῦ, Murray adding the qualification, 'teste Pul-tonio': for οὖν (VBL), MAV<sup>2</sup> give  $\eta\eta$  and P nothing. The conjectures based on these discrepancies are negligible: κοῦδαμοῦ μετῆν φρενῶν may be mentioned, but only because its authors were Kirchhoff and Nauck. Wecklein, without the shadow of a reason, deleted the verse.

<sup>2</sup> Certainly not because here, as it happens,

the preceding two sentences were also interrogative. See *Soph. Al.* 1272–81, followed immediately by the triumphant: ἀρ' ὑμῖν οὗτος ταῦν' ἔδρασεν ἐνδίκαι; (1282).

<sup>3</sup> So the passage ought to be written from V (ἀρ' εὐτύχησεν Ἑλλάς, ὠλόμην δ' ἐγώ): P—which gives ἀρ'—accidentally omits δ', and  $\rho$  therefore conjectured δ' εὐτύχησεν, which has had the luck to become the vulgate.

<sup>4</sup> So Wecklein, rightly, for ἀρ' ἐξήδης: Cobet's ἐξήδησθ' was pure carelessness—for a second person, classical or not, destroys the sense.

and conversely κύμνον ἔσπειρεν for κύμνον ἔπρ[ε]ιεν Demetr. ἔρμ. 156; ξένοια πάρεισιν for ξένοι, πάρεισιν and τοὺς παρόντας for οὐ παρόντας *I.T.* 728 and *Suppl.* 649, and conversely παρόν for σπαρέν Heliod. iv. 8 and παρόντα for σπαρέντα (<sup>1</sup>) Phalar. p. 488, 25 Hr.; ἐνιπείν for ἐνισπείν *Suppl.* 435, λοιπός for λισπός Ar. fr. 544, παρ' ἀσπίδα for πραπίδα *Bacch.* 427, ἔτι ποτ' for τίς ποτ' *Suppl.* 623, and the like everywhere in moderate manuscripts. A good example for the present purpose is V's πανία (the word does not follow a σ) for σπανία at *Rhes.* 245.<sup>1</sup>

As a respite from these vacillations, I take a passage where there can be no doubt in any mind as regards the corruption, and where there is very little in my own as regards the remedy:

*I.T.* 860 ff.

*Iφ.* . . . παρὰ δὲ βωμὸν ἦν δάκρυα καὶ γόοι.

φεῦ φεῦ χερνίβων ἐκεῖ.

*Ορ.* ὦμωξα καὶ γὰρ τόλμαν ἦν ἔτλη πατήρ.

The mutilation of the archetype, which has damaged so many passages of this play, has left 861 metrically and otherwise deficient, and it is necessary to expand *εκεῖ*—in all human probability to a dochmius, though Dr. Murray contents himself with Seidler's unassuming cretic <τῶν> ἐκεῖ. Wecklein conjectured ἐκεῖ <φονίων>, Kirchhoff ἐκεῖ <τῶν ἐμῶν>, Koechly ἐκεῖ <τῶν πικρῶν>: Schroeder printed φεῦ φεῦ χερνίβων <ἀνοσίων> ἐκεῖ, which is barely Greek, and ignores the fact that these mutilations take place at the end of lines. In reality, one syllable only is unknown: for two are furnished by Orestes with his ὦμωξα καὶ γὰρ. Examples are hardly called for, but one may quote: *El.* 1167 f. *Κλ.* ἰὼ μοί μοι. | *Χο.* ὦμωξα καὶ γὰρ πρὸς τέκνων χειρουμένης, *Hipp.* 1314 f. *Θη.* οἶμοι. | *Αρ.* δάκνει σε, *Θησεῦ*, μῦθος; ἀλλ' ἔχ' ἥσυχος, | τοῦνθένδ' ἀκούσας ὡς ἂν οἰμώξης πλέον, *Soph. O.C.* 820 *Οἰ.* οἶμοι. *Κρ.* τάχ' ἔξεις μᾶλλον οἰμώζειν τάδε, *Αἰ.* 939 *Τε.* ἰὼ μοί μοι, | οὐδὲν σ' ἀπιστῶ καὶ δις οἰμῶξαι, γύναι, *El.* 788 οἶμοι τάλαινα· νῦν γὰρ οἰμῶξαι πάρα, *Aesch. Ag.* 1072 *Κα.* ὅτοτοτοῖ . . . | *Χο.* τί ταῦτ' ἀνωτότυνας ἀμφὶ Λοξίου; *ib.* 1307 *Κα.* φεῦ φεῦ. | *Χο.* τί τοῦτ' ἐφενξας;—Iphigenia therefore said: φεῦ φεῦ χερνίβων

<sup>1</sup> An excellent emendation, which appears to have made no converts, is Goram's ἐν Ταύροις πέσω at *I.T.* 1010, which ought in all probability to be written: ἀξω δέ σ' ἥπερ μὴ αὐτὸς ἐν Ταύροις πέσω κτέ. (ἀξω δέ σ' Canter: ἤξω δέ γ' || μαντὸς Markland: καὶ τὸς || ἐν Ταύροις Goram: ἐνταυθοῖ). And, as I am not likely ever to have a more specious excuse for emending *Anach. ep.* 2 ca. init., I use the opportunity. Anacharsis is advising Solon not to allow the peculiarities of Scythian garb to warp his judgement upon Scythian wits, and he does so in these words: στήλαι δὲ καὶ κόσμοι σώματος μὴ γενέσθωσαν ἐμπόδιον ὀρθῆς κρίσεως, ἄλλοι γὰρ ἄλλως κατὰ νόμους πατέρων κεκοσμήκασιν τὰ σώματα. For στήλαι Westermann conjectured στολαί, and so (with κόσμος) Hercher reads. But anyone who, for his sins, has trudged what Democritus would have called the μακρὴ ὁδὸς ἀπανδόκεντος of the Didot *Epistolographi* must, I think, concede that the best professional manner calls for a little more local colour: πῖλοι\* δὲ καὶ κόσμοι[σ]\* σώματος κτέ. For if Timnes—or Tymnes, εἰ τὸδ' αὐτῷ φίλον κεκλημένῳ—told Herodotus the truth, Anacharsis was uncle 'Ιδανθύρσου τοῦ Σκυθίων βασιλέως (iv. 76), and therefore a *pilleatus*

(Iordanes v. 39 *ut refert Dio*—in the *Getica*— . . . qui dicit primum Tarbosteseos, deinde vocalos pilleatos hos qui inter eos generosi extabant, ex quibus eis et reges et sacerdotes ordinabantur: see Budé's *Dio* t. ii. 394, 399, with *or.* lxxii. 3, and compare also Luc. *Scyth.* i οἱ οἰκοὶ δὲ οὐ τοῦ βασιλείου γένους ὦν (Toxaris) οὐδὲ τῶν πειλοφορικῶν, ἀλλὰ Σκυθῶν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ δημοτικῶν, οἳ εἰσι παρ' αὐτοῖς οἱ ὀκτάποδες καλούμενοι). By way of abusing the opportunity, I correct also *ep.* 9 (p. 104, 40): ἵνα τε γῆς χρώματα διαφόρους μαστεύοντες θαῦμα πεποιήνται. This alone is the authentic tradition, preserved in L: Hercher's text is drawn from interpolated sources and depraved further by himself. Read simply ἱνάς\* τε γῆς χρώματι\* διαφόρους (gold and silver) κτέ.: cf. Plut. *def. or.* 434 B in. μολύς οἷον ἱνὲς ἢ τριχὲς ἀραιὰ διατρέχουσιν ἐν τοῖς μέταλλοις. The whole epistle is ruined by Hercher, who alters the soundest readings and leaves the most transparent corruptions untouched—for instance, a couple of sentences later: ἀποχέτευσιν ποιεῖσθαι κελύουσιν οἷς ἐπαινεῖν ἔρως ἐστίν. Read, of course: ὑγιαίνειν\*, and compare, if something has to be compared, Synes. *enc. calv.* 76A ὅστις ὑγιαίνειν ἐρᾷ, μμεῖσθω τὸν λατρικῆς εὐρετήν.

ἐκεῖ/κ  
the mo

If t  
that t  
When  
bound  
abhor  
when  
be pre  
To con  
charac  
*Or.* 423

Here,  
mann,  
φίλος.  
among  
of Eur  
are to  
incline  
upon i  
παλαι  
ἔφυν φ  
(certiss  
verse i  
to the  
of the  
explain  
was th

<sup>1</sup> Phi  
appears  
ἀπ' ἐκεῖ  
at vit. Λ  
καὶ ἔχιν  
λαχμωμέ  
the rid  
reprinte  
translat  
are the  
τ' ἐκεῖν  
ἀντοι  
did not  
'that' an

<sup>2</sup> If t  
to be a  
the well  
ἢ τέθνη  
τάληθές,  
the trad  
else. N



ἐκεῖ(νων· οἶμοι),\* and, to my own thinking, she is to be congratulated on choosing the most impressive word in the language.<sup>1</sup>

If this supplement has any likelihood, it is, of course, due to a pair of accidents—that the metre betrays the lacuna and that there is an external clue to its content. When both those conditions are absent, as they usually are, emendation by lacuna is bound to be a dangerous and unremunerative trade. Since, in addition, all editors abhor a void,<sup>2</sup> the asterisk is a rare sight in classical texts. And yet there are times when the outsider of my own type wonders if that emblem of surrender might not be preferable to death in the last ditch of impossible conjecture or incredible exegesis. To come to details may be hazardous, but I venture to quote a passage which I think characteristic:

Or. 423 f.

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἶμα μητέρος θεαί.

Ορ. οὐ σοφὸς ἀληθὴς δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυσ κακός.

Here, with the exception of Kirchhoff, the editors *maiorum gentium*—Porson, Hermann, Dindorf, Nauck, and Murray—print, after Brunck, ἀληθὴς δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυν φίλος. The phalanx is imposing; and yet, it seems to me, the conjecture may rank among the most dubious which have ever insinuated themselves into a standard text of Euripides. Diplomatically it is a naked absurdity; and, if the words ἔφυν φίλος are to be supposed to have been lost by accident (as may be inferred from Dr. Murray's inclined brackets), what manner of man was it who, noticing the lacuna, meditated upon it, felt confidence in his power to fill it, had Greek enough to know that the παλαιοὶ said ἔφυν and not ἐφύην, and then, with his very parchment crying aloud for ἔφυν φίλος, evolved ἔφυν κακός? Even if, by faith, we acquiesce in Brunck's emendation (*certissima coniectura*, says Porson, who was a specialist in certain conjectures), the verse is an irrelevance—no answer to the one foregoing, which it ignores; no prelude to the one following, by which it is ignored. Only on the hypothesis that 424 consists of the beginning of one line and the end of another can the phenomena be rationally explained; and Kirchhoff, therefore, with a sigh, concluded that the price of truth was the moving spectacle:

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἶμα μητέρος θεαί.

Ορ. \* \* \* \* \*

Με. \* \* \* ἐς φίλους ἔφυν κακός.

Ορ. οὐ σοφὸς ἀληθὴς δ' \* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Philostratus, who was a judge of such things, appears to have agreed with me (*Ep.* 5 Σκύθης . . . ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ βωμοῦ), but not so his editors: for at *vit. Apoll.* ii. 14 Kayser destroyed the pretty: καὶ ἔχοντα ὥσθι ποτὲ τοὺς ὄφεις οὓς ἀπέτεκε λυχωμένη καὶ θεραπεύουσα ἐκείνη τῇ γλώττῃ, by the ridiculous conjecture ἐκκειμένη, which is reprinted in the Loeb Philostratus and even translated by Phillimore. Equally lamentable are the attempts, at *Tro.* 1188, to displace ὕπνοι τ' ἐκείνοι by such things as ὕπνοι τε κοινοὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τε κλίνειν—as though the tragedy of life did not chiefly reside in the necessity of saying 'that' and not 'this'.

<sup>2</sup> If the void has to be acknowledged, it has to be a very little one. A curious instance is the well-known passage: *O.T.* 943 f. *Io.* πῶς εἶπας; ἢ τέθνηκε Πόλυβος; *Ay.* εἰ δὲ μὴ | λέγω γ' ἐγὼ τῶν ἁλῶν, ἀξιώ θανεῖν. That, and nothing else is the tradition, and it is impossible, and nothing else. Nauck, by one of the clearest and best

corrections ever made in the dramatists, restored the hand of Sophocles: *Io.* πῶς εἶπας; ἢ τέθνηκε Οἰδίπου πατήρ; | *Ay.* τέθνηκε Πόλυβος· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀξιώ θανεῖν. The reason for the corruption, which Nauck unaccountably failed to notice ('eine zu εἰ δὲ μὴ beigeschriebene Erklärung λέγω τὸ ἀληθές mag zur Entstellung des Textes den Anlass geboten haben'), is sun-clear: the eye of some transcriber passed from τέθνηκεν to τέθνηκε, and the relics: *Io.* πῶς εἶπας; ἢ τέθνηκε Πόλυβος· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀξιώ θανεῖν were expanded to two trimeters. Yet even in the Oxford text the lines appear thus: *Io.* πῶς εἶπας; ἢ τέθνηκε (ν Οἰδίπου πατήρ); | *Ay.* εἰ μὴ λέγω τῶν ἁλῶν, ἀξιώ θανεῖν—the second part of Nauck's proposal (as vital as the first) is not mentioned. That is to say, rather than admit the loss of four words where the loss of some words is undeniable, the unanimous testimony of every manuscript that counts is thrown to the winds by a falsification of εἰ δὲ μὴ λέγω γ' ἐγὼ to εἰ μὴ λέγω, and a palmary emendation



The task of peopling the stellar spaces he left to others, and the difficulties seem not inconsiderable. But he has complicated matters needlessly by his inversion of the two halves of 424:<sup>1</sup> for it is easy enough to satisfy all demands of the context and to provide a prima-facie excuse for the scribe by writing something on the lines of:

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἷμα μητέρος θεαί.

Ορ. κἀγὼ μετῆλθον ἄλλο σὺν τάχει τινί.

Με. οὐ σοφός, ἀληθής δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυσ φίλος.

Ορ. οὐ σοφὸν ἂν εἴποιμι· δὲ φίλοις ἔφυσ κακός.\*

Two other passages may have a few words, as in both the three symptoms by which cases of omission may, as a rule, be diagnosed seem to me exceptionally clear; in both rational interpretation is hardly possible; in both the tradition resists sane alteration; in both the gist of the lacuna, if lacuna there be, is clear.

Hel. 353 ff.

φόνιον αἰώρημα

διὰ δέρης ὀρέξομαι

ἢ ξιφοκτόνον δαῖγμόν

αἰμορύτου σφαγᾶς

αὐτοσίδαρον ἔσω πελάσσω διὰ σαρκὸς ἀμύλλαν.

So runs Wecklein's text, δαῖγμόν αἰμορύτου—the joint property of himself, F. W. Schmidt, Nauck, Hartung, and Reiske—being a plausible emendation of a probably corrupt δῖωγμα λαμορύτου. As to the words preceding, φόνιον αἰώρημα means 'a murderous means of suspension', or, in the non-lyric style, 'a halter'; διὰ δέρης means 'through the neck' (as at Or. 41 σῖτα διὰ δέρης ἐδέξατο, and everywhere else); ὀρέξομαι means 'I shall reach for', and is construed with a genitive (Or. 328, Ion 842, Hel. 1238, Archel. fr. 242 N.)—for at Or. 303 the oldest and best manuscript gives, not σῖτον τ' ὄρεξαι, but σῖτων τ' ὄρεξαι, and the epic χεῖρ' ὀρέγεσθαι (Ω 506) is irrelevant. When the neck is mentioned in connexion with suspension, the following phrases commended themselves to Euripides: ἀμφὶ βρόχον λευκᾷ καθαρμοῦζουσα δειρᾷ *Hipp.* 771, αἶμα δέρης ib. 781, ἐξάψει βρόχον ἀμφὶ δειράν *Ion* 1065, εὐτρέπιζε . . . βρόχον δέρη *Or.* 953, ἀπαρτῆσαι δέρην *Andr.* 412, ἀρτῆσαι δέρην ib. 811, βρόχῳ δέρην οὐρανίῳ πελάσσαι *Alc.* 229, βρόχῳ

is degraded to an idle guess which has far less than one chance in ten thousand to be right.

<sup>1</sup> At *Phoen.* 878 f. all manuscripts but P (which has ποῖα for ὀποῖα) offer: ἀγὼ τί δρῶν ὀποῖα δ' οὐ λέγων ἔπη, | εἰς ἔχθος ἦλθον παῖσι τοῖσιν Οἰδίπῳ;—the scholia recording a good variant, εἰς ἔχλον ἦλθον. Murray gives, with some Byzantines, τί (οὐ) δρῶν, ποῖα δ' κτέ. (others had tried τί δρῶν (οὐ)), cites Σ τὸ οὐ ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, τί οὐ δρῶν· γράφεται δὲ κἀγὼ τί μὴ δρῶν ποῖα δ' (Kirchhoff's version is γράφεται δὲ καὶ ἀγὼ τί μὴ δρῶν ποῖα δ' κτέ., but I have not Schwartz at hand), and concludes: 'lectio dubia: cf. ad Hel. 56', where our manuscripts give τί δῆρ' ἐτι ζῶ; and those of Aristophanes (*Thesm.* 868) τί οὖν ἐτι ζῶ; 'fortasse recte'. The lection certainly is dubious: ἀγὼ is in the air, and the negative for δρῶν can only be procured at the cost of a probably illegitimate hiatus. Kirchhoff was so little satisfied that he assumed the loss of a verse between 878 and 879. The assumption is reasonable, though speculative, but again he misplaced his asterisks: for, if 878 and 879 are the first and third verses of a trio, then, whatever

the second verse, the necessity for τί οὐ δρῶν in the first is not removed. The lacuna, if it exists, comes where the break is betrayed by the jobbing repair ὀποῖα. No doubt, a number of passable supplements might be invented; to myself Melpomene suggests nothing better than:

ἀγὼ τί δρῶν (ἀπειπον ἐξιώμενος  
σπουδῇ ματαίᾳ); \* ποῖα δ' οὐ λέγων ἔπη κτέ.

Again, at *Soph. Phil.* 1250 ff.

Οδ. στρατὸν δ' Ἀχαιῶν οὐ φοβῆ πράσσωσι τάδε;

Νε. ξὺν τῷ δικαίῳ τὸν σὸν οὐ ταρβῶ φόβον.

Οδ. \* \* \*

Νε. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοι σὴ χειρὶ πείθομαι τὸ δρῶν κτέ. the universally accepted asterisks are due to Hermann, who, like Dobree, required also: τὸν σὸν οὐ ταρβῶ στρατὸν. The vulgate is defensible at a pinch, but usage speaks in favour of the change (see, for example, van Leeuwen on *Av.* 893), and Hermann could have had his στρατὸν without the change of a letter or the addition of a star:

Νε. ξὺν τῷ δικαίῳ τὸν σὸν οὐ ταρβῶ (στρατὸν.

Οδ. \* \* \* \* \* } φόβον.\*

γ' ἀφα  
to den  
round  
must a  
whose  
which

'Nil m  
dedit,  
three.  
1504 ff  
τοῖσι π

At

All wo  
so, an  
Herm  
the bo  
would  
experi  
in ord  
dismiss  
'we ma  
done l  
things  
corone  
panied  
solecism  
Weckl  
take o  
the lar  
one lin  
his exi

In wh  
αἰσπι

Th  
many  
think  
to dou  
I.T. 28

<sup>1</sup> καὶ  
Koechl  
stein, \*

γ' ἄψασαν εὐγενῇ δέρην *Hel.* 136. These are the available *phōdes justificatives* by which to demonstrate that *φόνιον αἰώρημα διὰ δέρης ὀρέξομαι* means: 'I shall fasten a halter round my neck.' If anyone declines the attempt, which has of course been made, he must alter *διὰ δέρης* into *περὶ δέρην*, explain the corruption, and then produce the verb whose resemblance to *ὀρέξομαι* can deceive the eye, which has the same scansion, and which is synonymous with *περιάπτω*. Otherwise, he must capitulate by:

φόνιον αἰώρημα

\* \*

διὰ δέρης ὀρέξομαι κτέ.\*

'Nil melius', says Seneca, 'aeterna lex fecit quam quod unum introitum nobis ad vitam dedit, exitus multos'; but, if you wear a buskin or a sock, the emergency exits are but three. One might call many witnesses, but I content myself with Pluto (*ap. Ar. Ran.* 1504 ff.) καὶ δὸς τουτὶ (sc. τὸ ξίφος) Κλεοφῶντι φέρων, | καὶ τουτουσὶ (sc. τοὺς βρόχους) τοῖσι πορισταῖς, | Μύρμηκί θ' ὁμοῦ καὶ Νικομάχῳ | τόδε δ' (sc. τὸ κύνειον) Ἀρχενόμῳ κτέ.

At *I.T.* 632 ff., the issue is one of natural science, for the Greek runs crystal-clear:

πολὺν τε γὰρ σοι κόσμον ἐνθήσω τάφῳ,  
ξανθῷ τ' ἐλαίῳ σῶμα σὸν κατασβέσω.

All would be better than well, if olive-oil extinguished flame, but it is said not to do so, and one must be a little more subtle: 'Fire', then, according to Paley (and to Hermann), 'is not put out by oil; but it is made to burn itself out the faster; so that the bones might have been collected perhaps in a less calcined condition than they would otherwise have been.' To determine the degrees of calcination, two separate experiments would be necessary, and, though Wilamowitz once turned a handmill in order to settle the metre of ἄλει, μύλα, ἄλει κτέ., here the indolent, such as Weil, dismiss this ingenious piece of hermeneutics as a *plaisanterie*. England holds that 'we may well understand by σῶμα here the smouldering ashes left when the fire had done burning'. Even so there persists an uneasy feeling that this is one of those things which might have been expressed differently, and many inquests of many coroners have testified that the application of oil to smouldering embers is accompanied by a spice of adventure. Conjecture fails: for Geel's *κατασκεδῶ* brings a solecism in its train; Musgrave's *καταστελῶ* is not so used; and everything else in Wecklein is a temerity or an eccentricity or both.<sup>1</sup> I fail to see what is left save to take one's courage in both hands and assume that once upon a time some slave of the lamp, by an accident never sufficiently to be regretted, left out the equivalent of one line in one column in the endless procession of lines and columns which blighted his existence—in other words, to write:

ξανθῷ τ' ἐλαίῳ σῶμα σὸν \* \* κατασβέσω.

In which case, the extinguishing agent was not oil but wine (*κατὰ πυρκαϊὴν σβέσαν αἰθοσι οἶνῳ Ψ 250, Ω 791*).

That the method has its dangers must be granted. In one passage, on which many notes were written of yore by candidates in Honour Moderations, I used to think it unavoidable; but an alternative, which I have not seen suggested, causes me to doubt. The place is

*I.T.* 284 ff.

καὶ βοῶ κυναγὸς ὥς·

Πυλάδῃ, δέδορκας τήνδε; τήνδε δ' οὐχ ὄρῃς

Ἄιδου δράκαιναν, ὥς με βούλεται κτανεῖν

δευαῖς ἐχίδναις εἰς ἐμ' ἐστομαμένῃ;

<sup>1</sup> καθαγνίσω Camper, καταφεκῶ οἱ κατακλύσω Koehly, στέφω κατά Bergk, καταπλάσω Rauchenstein, κατασπερῶ Ziegler, καταρρανῶ Gloël, σὴν Goram.

ἡ δ' ἐκ χιτώνων πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον  
 πτεροῖς ἐρέσσει, μητέρ' ἀγκάλας ἐμὴν  
 ἔχουσα, πέτρινον ὄχθον, ὡς ἐπεμβάλη.

In the first line, Nauck's excellent *κυν(ώπιδα)* (drawn from *Or.* 260), may well be right instead of the traditional *κυναγός ὡς*, which inverts the roles of hunter and quarry: for the archetype of LP was in this drama a decidedly dog-eared tome. In what follows, Orestes describes the conventional trinity of Furies. While the first two are concerned, his words are plain enough: in the case of the third, *πέτρινον ὄχθον* is presumably delirium, but *χιτώνων* is lunacy, and therefore—*εἰρήσεται γάρ*—less repellent than the idiocy of most of the conjectures. They need not be transcribed: he who finds the name of Hermann attached to *χλιδώνων* ('olim κενώνων'), that of Badham to *χελυνών*, and that of Nauck to *ἐγκυτὶς νῶν*, may close Wecklein. Kirchhoff, whose temperament guaranteed him from such lapses, thought of *ἡ δ' ἐκ τρίτων αὖ*, but the proposal, though not impossible, is too far from the ductus to have any cogency. The course which once seemed to me right—to mark the loss of two hemistiches after *χιτώνων*—has been advocated by Wecklein, but to divine their form or even their content is beyond my power.<sup>1</sup> In addition, I know of no passage where *χιτώνες* is used of one *χιτών*. The choice, to the best of my judgement, lies between Kirchhoff's conjecture and another which looks technically preferable and may be otherwise not inferior. If, in a progenitor of LP, there stood the reading: *ἡ ἐκ χιτώνων δὲ πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον*, then, the moment any corrector arrived at the place, it was predestined to become: *ἡ δ' ἐκ χιτώνων κτέ*. But, had that reading by some hazard drifted unscathed down the tide of time, there would now have stood in most texts, probably on the conjecture of Markland:

ἡ κ γειτόνων δέ\* πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον.

Nor, for my own part, should I have felt any qualms. The eye of Orestes passes from the dog-fiend to the dragon, then to the neighbouring and more dreadful form which bears his mother's corpse, marble and mountain-huge, and exhales death and flame, not *ἐκ χιτώνων* nor *ἐκ χαλινῶν* nor *ἐκ σκοτεινῶν* nor even *ἀγχι νῶτων*, but simply through that humdrum aperture, the mouth. And, if in his agitation, he uses the words *ἐκ γειτόνων*, which are not elsewhere found in tragedy, it remains none the less true that the phrase, with or without the article, figurative in sense or not figurative, was unquestioned Greek from the golden age to the bronze (a miscellany of examples may be found in Davis' and Markland's notes on *Max. Tyr.* xli. 3 *παρὰ πόδας τὰ δυσχερῆ, ἐκ γειτόνων τὰ κακά*); while, if its appearances in comedy and the later prose are set aside, it can still be shown by the help of *Lycurgus* (§ 21) and of *Plato* (*Rep.* 531 A) to have been no mere colloquialism but an expression fit for the best of company. The change itself is light: few minuscule confusions are easier than that between γ and χ, and, in effect, nothing else is involved. For, in regard to the conflicting claims of ο and ω,<sup>2</sup> the manuscripts of the tragedians maintain an iron neutrality undisturbed by grammatical or metrical incidents: *ἀλγεινῶς ἐξεπέμπετ'* opens a trimeter at *Soph. O.C.* 1664, *Ἀργείων ὄχλον* another at *Eur. Or.* 119, *ὦ τλήμων* a third

<sup>1</sup> And, it appears to me, beyond Wecklein's. At any rate, when he made the attempt, he produced only: *ἡ δ' ἐκ χιτώνων* (νυκτὶ προσφερών *ιδεῖν* | ἐμοὶ στοματὸν) *πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον κτέ*. The words themselves have been hammered out on the basis of *ἔδοξ'* *ιδεῖν* *τρεῖς* *νυκτὶ* *προσφερεῖς* *κόρας* (*Or.* 408), coupled with a hint from *ἐστομαμένη* above and the recollection of an emendation by Hermann in an Aeschylean fragment. The underlying theory would seem to be that, while

to speak of a Fury breathing fire and slaughter from the shirt(s) is a thing that cannot be done, all proprieties of thought and language are adequately safeguarded, if you add in Johnsonian Greek that the shirt is as black as midnight. Those of the Erinyes were, however, according to the best authorities, only dark-grey.

<sup>2</sup> I venture an emendation of *Xen. Cyr.* vii. 5. 25, which I transcribe with Mr. Marchant's note: *οὐδὲν ἂν εἴη θανμαστόν εἰ καὶ ἀκλειστοὶ αἱ πόλεις αἱ*

at 1613,  
 ἀμβρῶν  
 expand  
 figurati

For the  
 εἰπόμη  
 dubiou  
 ἐκάλεσε  
 (σιν); a  
 any ag  
 haps, s

Herma  
 cognov  
 commo  
 approv  
 ἦλθον τ  
 ἵνα σὺ μ  
 the tw  
 verse v  
 he mig

'Before  
 is a du  
 shrink

τοῦ βα  
 τῆδε τῇ  
 'εἰ  
 δοκ  
 Ste  
 pos  
 χεῖ  
 ἐν  
 de  
 acc

The so  
 phon o  
 would  
 εἰοικεν  
 14. i  
 τῶν σ  
 συκοφα  
 χρηστο  
 καὶ δι  
 δοκεῖν  
 prefera  
 κλειδης  
 Πόλεω  
 τὰς δ'  
 4599-

at 1613, *πῶλῳ* concludes a fourth at *Ion* 1154, while at *Tro.* 537 P transmits impartially *ἀμβρότῳ πόλῳ*. And, if our allotted years were seventy times seven, the list might be expanded to any required dimensions. Hence, if I knew an early example of the figurative use of *σπᾶσθαι*, I should write with a quiet mind at *Soph. Trach.* 1071 ff.:

ὅστις ὥστε παρθένος  
βέβρυχα κλαίων· καὶ τόδ' οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ποτε  
τόνδ' ἄνδρα φαίῃ πρόσθ' ἰδεῖν δεδρακότα,  
ἀλλ' ἀστένακτος αἰὲν ἐσπώμην\* κακοῖς.

For the manuscript tradition is *ἐσπώμην*, the corruption or correction of which into *εἰσπώμην* (*Σ Ai.* 317) is far more probable than the reverse process; *εἰσπώμην* itself is dubious (it need only be said that Jebb's parallel is *Eur. Phoen.* 413 ὁ δαίμων μ' ἐκάλεσεν πρὸς τὴν τύχην, reinforced by ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ and ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς πράγμασι); and the metaphor in *ἐσπώμην* is sufficiently natural to occur to any writer of any age—certainly no reader would stumble at the sense of *distrahebar*.—Nor, perhaps, should the case be taken as finally closed at *H.F.* 616 f.:

Αμ. οὐδ' οἶδεν Εὐρυσθεύς σε γῆς ἦκοντ' ἄνω.  
Ηρ. οὐκ οἶδεν· ἐλθὼν τάνθ' εἰδείην πάρος.

Hermann mistranslated the last words by 'reversus, rei domesticae statum prius cognoverim', but most of his successors have supposed them to be faulty, and the common correction is *Matthiae's* οὐκ οἶδ'· ἔν' ἐλθὼν τάνθ' εἰδείην πάρος, though Nauck approved F.W. Schmidt's ἐλθεῖν δ' ἐνθάδ' εἰσπώμην, and Wilamowitz read, with Musgrave, ἦλθον τάνθ' εἰδέναι. *Matthiae* vindicated his elliptical *ἔνα* by *Ion* 950 ὁ παῖς δὲ τοῦ ὅστιν; ἔνα σὺ μηκέτ' ἦς ἄπαις, and—although there is far more than a shade of difference between the two passages—it cannot be denied that by a slight change he has produced a verse which no one would dare to call impossible. On the other hand, it seems to me, he might, by a change not greatly heavier, have produced a much more powerful line:

οὐκ οἶδεν· ἐλθόντ' ἐνθάδ' εἰδείη\* πάρος.

'Before he hears I have returned to earth, may he hear I have been at Thebes.' It is a dull ear that is deaf to the undertone,<sup>1</sup> and possibly a too cautious breast that shrinks from the changes of ω to ο, of εἰδείη to εἰδείην, and of α to ε.

τοῦ βασιλείου εἶεν· κωμάζει γὰρ ἡ πόλις πᾶσα  
τῇδε τῇ νυκτί.

'εἶεν' ὡς ἐν CAEGH κωμάζει] κώμῳ  
δοκεῖ CAEGH: κωμοδοκεῖ DF: κωμάζει  
Stephanus: ἐν κώμῳ Muretus addito εἶναι  
post πᾶσα: εὐωχεῖται Madvig, unde εὐω-  
χεῖσθαι γὰρ δοκεῖ Schenkl: δειπνεῖ Hug: ὡς  
ἐν omisi quod videtur varia lectio esse:  
deinde aptissimam coniecturam Stephani  
accepi.

The solution does no injustice either to Xenophon or to the reader; but from the data one would suspect that Gobryas said: κώμῳ δ' εἰοικεν\* ἡ πόλις πᾶσα κτέ. At *Resp. Ath.* i. 14. i n., δοκοῦσι is again impossible: περὶ δὲ τῶν συμμάχων, οἱ (del. Morus) ἐκπλέοντες συκοφαντοῦσιν ὡς δοκοῦσι καὶ μισοῦσι τοὺς χρηστοὺς κτέ. Mr. Marchant quotes Zurbrig's καὶ διώκουσι, but, as the confusion between δοκεῖν and δεῖν is ubiquitous, καὶ δοῦσι\* seems preferable: compare *Plut. Per.* 16 ὁ δὲ Τηλεκλείδης παραδεδωκέναι φησὶν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους Πόλεων τε φόρους αὐτὰς τε πόλεις, τὰς μὲν δεῖν, τὰς δ' ἀναλύνειν.

<sup>1</sup> When the hinted deed is done the chorus sings (809 ff.):

κρείσσων μοι τύραννος ἔφες  
ἢ δυσγένει' ἀνάκτων,  
ἂ νῦν ἐσορᾶν φαίνει  
ξυψηφόρων ἐς ἀγώνων  
ἄμυλλαν, εἰ τὸ δίκαιον  
θεοῖς ἔτ' ἀρέσκει.

For the spaced words, unmeaning, unmetrical, and *me iudice* unemended, I propose simply: ἐσορώσα φαίνει\* κτέ. The sense, at any rate, is clear and good: 'Thou art a better prince for me than those baseborn kings who now, looking thy sword in face, make it abounding plain whether or no the good cause is still the cause of God.' With the language there can be no quarrel: for the rather uncommon use of φαίνει, compare *Soph. Trach.* 1158 φανεῖς ὅποῖος ὦν ἀνὴρ ἐμὸς καλῇ, and for the rest such passages as: ἐς κρᾶνος βλέψαντα καὶ λόγχης ἀκμήν *Suppl.* 318, εἰ μὴ κυρήσεις . . . | φεύγοντας ἀλλὰ σὸν βλέποντας ἐς δόρυ *Rhes.* 113 f., ἐς χέρας λεύσσεις ἐμὰς; *Phoen.* 597, κακῇ δ' ἐς ἀλκὴν καὶ σιδηρὸν εἰσορᾶν *Med.* 264, *et simm.*

To go back for a moment to the vocalization of *χιτώνων* and *γειτόνων*—not much ink need be spent over the claims of *ει* and *ι*: when i-sounds are concerned, then οὐδέν ὁ τι οὐ γίγνεται καὶ ἔτι περαιτέρω. The case of *Trö.* 1203 ff. has at least the charm of simplicity. There Hecuba reflects:

θνητῶν δὲ μῶρος ὅστις εὖ πράσσειν δοκῶν  
βέβαια χαίρει· τοῖς τρόποις γὰρ αἱ τύχαι,  
ἐμπληκτος ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοσε  
πηδῶσι, κούδεις αὐτὸς εὐτυχεῖ ποτε.

At the beginning, Herwerden's *εὖ πράσσειν δοκεῖ* | *βέβαια χαίρειν* may be hardly necessary, but is not negligible. At the end, Dr. Murray remarks, after Bothe: 'αὐτὸς ('ipse per se') VP', and so he reads. I do not think it would be mere frivolity to object that the Latin for *αὐτὸς* is not *ipse per se* but *ipse*, and that the Greek for *ipse per se* is not *αὐτὸς* but *αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ*. Valckenaer, on *Phoen.* 927, included the verse in his list of passages where he would read *ὠντός* for *αὐτός*, and in most texts *αὐτός* now appears. The sense which it is intended to convey, though it breaks under the load, is merely:

κού δις\* αὐτὸς εὐτυχεῖ ποτε.

Nor is the misspelling of more consequence than P's *εὐτυχῇ* a word later.

Nor is *Andr.* 979 ff. much more complex:

κάγῳ ταπεινὸς ὦν τύχαις ταῖς οἰκοθεν  
ἤλγουν μὲν ἤλγουν, συμφοραῖς δ' ἡνειχόμεν,  
σῶν δὲ στερηθεὶς ψυχόμεν ἄκων γάμων.

Scaliger removed the solecism by *συμφορὰς δ' ἡνειχόμεν*, L. Dindorf by *συμφοραῖς δ' ἡνειχόμεν*: but it is hard to believe that Euripides could write anything except

ἤλγουν μὲν ἤλγουν συμφορὰς ἐν' εἰχόμεν,\*  
σῶν δὲ στερηθεὶς ψυχόμεν ἄκων γάμων.

As a matter of routine one may quote *Ion* 1252 ἴσμεν, ὦ τάλανα, τὰς σὰς συμφορὰς, ἐν' εἰ τύχης, *Or.* 447 ἡκεῖς συμφορὰς ἐς τοῦσχατον, *Trö.* 684 ἐς ταῦτόν ἡκεῖς συμφορὰς, *Hel.* 1194 ἐν τῷ δὲ κείσαι συμφορὰς; *Soph. Ant.* 1229 ἐν τῷ δὲ ξυμφορὰς διεφθάρης;—to which may be added *Eur. El.* 238 εἰ ζῆς, ὅπου τε ζῶσα συμφορὰς ἔχει, where Madvig's ὅπου . . . συμφορὰς ἔχει (ἐχῆ) is far more probable than Elmsley's generally received ὅπως . . . συμφορὰς ἔχεις. For the verb, cf. *Plat. Rep.* 395 D ἐν ξυμφοραῖς . . . ἐχομένην, *Laus* 887 E ἐν ξυμφοραῖς . . . ἐχομένων, *Hdt.* i. 35 συμφορῇ ἐχόμενος *sim.*

The confusion of 'τ μικρό' and 'ῆ μεγάλο'—if those names still exist—is not much better cloaked at *Hel.* 1621 ff.:

Θε. ὦ γυναικείαις τέχναισι αἰρεθείς ἐγὼ τάλας·  
ἐκπεφύγασιν γάμοι με. κεί μὲν ἦν ἀλώσιμος  
ναῦς διώγμασιν πονήσας εἶλον ἂν τάχα ξένους κτέ.

Most readers must have felt a touch of surprise on arriving at the lumbering *πνήσας*, though two alone seem to have tried to do better—Bothe with *πνηρούς*, Stadtmueller with *κλονήσας*. I should take it to be a simple corruption of *κονίσας*. For the confusion of *κ* and *π* is frequent when either letter yields a reasonably common word (e.g. *κώλοις* = *πώλοις* *Rhes.* 373, *ἄκοντα* = *ἀπόντα* *Hel.* 1546, *λεκτόν* (M) = *λεπτόν* hyp. ii *Or.*, *πέπλων* = *τέκνων* *H.F.* 925), and that the optical resemblance was at times disconcertingly close is shown by such readings as *ῆ κον* (*ῆ κον* Ek) = *ῆ που* at *Lys.* vi. 12, *ἐπισκόμενοι* (A) = *ἐπισπόμενοι* at *Plut. Oth.* 7, *κράξαντες* for *πράξαντες* at *D.*



Chrys. *or.* xxvii. 1, ἄοκνος for ἄνπνος at Procop. t. iii. 88, 18 Haury, and by many similar instances.

Soph. *Trach.* 1199:

γούου δὲ μηδὲν εἰσίστω δάκρυ·  
ἀλλ' ἀστένακτος κάδάκρυτος, εἵπερ εἴ  
τοῦδ' ἀνδρός, ἔρξον.

'Our poet', Blaydes once observed (on *El.* 349), 'is much given to peculiarities of style, and affects quaint and unusual expressions.' To correct that addiction Blaydes laboured with unflagging zeal to the close of his long term of years; and here, perturbed by the quaintness of 'Let no tear come in', and unconvinced by Wakefield's version 'Let no tear gush forth', he came to the rescue with ἐρπέτω, or ἐξίτω, or ἐκρείτω, or ἐκπέσω, or ἐκχέω, forgetting ἡκέτω, which was happily remembered later by F. W. Schmidt. And, after all, it seems permissible to ask: 'What does εἰσίστω mean?' According to Jebb's right-hand page, it is to be rendered, 'Let there be seen': according to his note, it is 'abs., come in, find a place there', and he cites Plat. *Phaedr.* 270 A (τὸ γὰρ ὑψηλόνουν τοῦτο καὶ πάντα τελεσιουργὸν εἰσὶν ἐντεῦθεν ποθεν εἰσιέναι)—a passage which evidently demonstrates that εἰσιέναι may mean 'to come in', and evidently demonstrates nothing else in the world. The one possible explanation he brushes aside: 'We ought not to supply σε, as if the sense were, "come into thy thoughts" (*Phaedo*, p. 58 E οὔτε . . . με . . . ἔλεος εἰσῆι.)'. That there is a gap of some width between εἰσῆλθε με οἶκτος, δέμα, φόβος, ἔρως, ὑποψία, δέος καὶ φροντίς, δεινόν τι, etc., and εἰσῆλθέ με δάκρυον is obvious, but it may well be bridgeable. Philostratus could venture: ἐπεὶ δ' ἤκουσεν Ἑλληνά τε καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι τὸν ἥκοντα, ἐσῆλθεν αὐτὸν Θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ Ἀθηναῖος (*V.A.T.* i. 29) and: ταῦτα ἀκούοντα τὸν Τελεσίνο . . . ἐσῆλθεν ὁ ἀνὴρ (*ib.* iv. 40); while the author, whoever he was, of *Phoen.* 1370 wrote: πολλοῖς δ' ἐπῆει δάκρυα τῆς τύχης ὄση, to the signal displeasure of Valckenaer. To me the dubious points are, first, the presence of μηδὲν; second, the circumstance that εἰσίστω is but a letter removed from a word simple, direct, and demonstrably Sophoclean. For turn Jebb's English into Greek of which it can be a translation, and we have:

γούου δὲ μηδὲν εἰσίδω\* δάκρυ·  
ἀλλ' ἀστένακτος κάδάκρυτος κτέ.

Compare, above, 802 ἀλλὰ μ' ἔκ γε τῆσδε γῆς | πόρθμευσον ὡς τάχιστα, μῆδ' αὐτοῦ θάνω, *O.C.* 174 μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ, Eur. *H.F.* 1399 ἀλλ' αἶμα μὴ σοῖς ἐξομόρξωμαι πέπλοις: that the idiom gives the minatory undertone required is shown by Φ 475 μὴ σευ νῦν ἔτι πατρός ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἀκούσω | εὐχομένου κτέ.

In a passage of this sort, where the traditional reading is, at worst, no more than disputable, the sole purpose of conjecture is to provide an extraneous test of probability. If the questioned reading proves to be, optically, the speaking likeness of a reading completely unquestionable, then its probability is diminished by an amount which must always be differently estimated by differing temperaments: if, on the other hand, it is not amenable to simple and direct emendation, not involving the hypothesis of two or more stages of corruption, nothing remains but to accept it as genuine. I give a pair of instances out of very many in which it seems to me impossible to decide with any confidence either for or against the tradition:

Eur. *Phoen.* 396 ff. Io. αἱ δ' ἐλπίδες βόσκουσι φυνάδας, ὡς λόγος.  
Πο. καλοῖς βλέπουσαί γ' ὄμμασιν, μέλλουσι δέ.  
Io. οὐδ' ὁ χρόνος αὐτὰς διεσάφησ' οὐσας κενάς;  
Πο. ἔχουσιν ἀφροδίτην τιν' ἠδείαν κακῶν.

In 399, can the *alliance de mots*, ἀφροδίτην . . . κακῶν be regarded as probable? The cases in which ἀφροδίτη is simply *venustas* (e.g. Luc. *Scyth.* 11 τοσαύτην ἀφροδίτην

ἐπὶ τῇ γλώττῃ ὁ νεανίαςκος ἔχει) seem to me hardly relevant here: still less so, those in which the word is a mere synonym of *libido* (e.g. *I.A.* 1264 μέμνηε δ' ἀφροδίτῃ τις Ἑλλήνων στρατῷ | πλεῖν ὡς τάχιστα). Musurus must have felt a qualm, for the Aldine gives ἡδεῖαν θεόν, upon which Musgrave built his conjecture ἡδεῖαν <ν>όσον; and a few proposals, chiefly by Blaydes in his more enterprising manner, are recorded by Wecklein. Herwerden, who was apt to go deeper than the root of the matter,<sup>1</sup> desired to write: ἔχουσιν Ἀφροδίτην τιν', ἴασιν κακῶν, but the change and the sentiment err on the side of optimism; and, as hope at the best is a bright interval, I should for my own part be content with

ἔχουσιν ἀφροδίτην τιν', εὐδῖαν κακῶν.

The metaphor, hackneyed later in Plutarch and his kind, was fresh then, but appears in each of the tragedians (Aesch. *S.c.T.* 795 πόλις δ' ἐν εὐδῖα κτέ., Soph. *Ichn.* 356 εἰς ἐμ' εὐδῖαν ἔχων, Eur. *Andr.* 1145 ἐν εὐδῖα δέ πως | ἔστη, *H.F.* 1048 εὐδὶ ἰαυόνθ'). The genitive is self-evident: for the type cf. e.g. *I.A.* 546 γαλανεῖα χρησάμενοι | μανιάδων οἴστρων.

Still on the border-line is *Hec.* 396 ff.:

Εκ. πολλή γ' ἀνάγκη θυγατρὶ συνθανεῖν ἐμέ.

Οδ. πῶς; οὐ γὰρ οἶδα δεσπότης κεκτημένος.

Εκ. ὅποια κισσὸς δρυὸς ὅπως τῆσδ' ἔξομαι.

Οδ. οὐκ, ἦν γε πείθῃ τοῖσι σοῦ σοφωτέροις.

That ὅπως ἔξομαι is legitimate, Porson showed from three passages, *Tro.* 146 f.,<sup>2</sup> *Ar. Eccl.* 297 ff. (ὅπως . . . καθεδούμεθ') and Antiphan. ap. Ath. 123 B (ἐν χύτρᾳ δέ μοι | ὅπως ὕδωρ ἔψοντα μῆδέν' ὀψομαι). But the question is rather: Why should Hecuba, who ought evidently to be direct and adamantine, fall back on a mode of expression, certainly not direct and prima facie not adamantine, when she might have said, as von Sybel would have liked her to say: ὅποια κισσὸς δρυὸς ἐγὼ τῆσδ' ἔξομαι? Or, granted that she spoke well if she spoke grammatically, was Ulysses grammatical, when he answered οὐκ and not οὐκ ἔστι? Against Reiske's *ὁμοία*, which—as several misadventures in the reading of papyri have shown—is hardly a change at all, the worst that can be said is that the verse would be a much better verse without

<sup>1</sup> So at *Tro.* 809: ὅθ' Ἑλλάδος ἀγαγε πρῶτον ἄνθος ἀτυζόμενος | πῶλιν κτέ., where his ἀτεμβόμενος is the only alteration cited by either Wecklein or Murray. ἀτυζόμενος, it must be granted, is about the least apposite participle in the language to apply to the mood of Hercules when he had been cheated of his horses; but it can conceal nothing more recondite than ἀτιζόμενος.\* For the genitive with ἀτιμάζω cf. Aesch. *P.V.* 783 μῆδ' ἀτιμάσσης λόγου (Elmsley: λόγους codd.), Soph. *O.C.* 49 μὴ μ' ἀτιμάσσης | τοιόνδ' ἀλήτην ὦν σε προστρέπω φράσαι, *Ant.* 21 τάφου . . . | τὸν μὲν προτίσας τὸν δ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχει: with ἀτιμός, *O.T.* 788, *El.* 1214, *Thuc.* iii. 58. 5. etc.: with ἀτίζω, *Ap. Rh.* i. 615 οὐνεκά μιν γεράων ἐπὶ δρυὸν ἀτίσαν. The change is the lightest possible: ἀτυζόμενος and ἀτιζόμενος are variants at *Pind. Ol.* viii. 39, ἀτύζει and ἀτίζει at *Nic. Alex.* 193.—On the other hand, at *Rhes.* 327: ὀρθῶς ἀτίσεις καπνίμοφος εἰ φίλοις, the word by itself would be inept, with ὀρθῶς it is fatuous. Here Herwerden tried κακίσεις, which seems to

me little better. The sense required is δικαίως ἀγανακτεῖς—that is to say: ὀρθῶς ἀγάζεις\* κτέ. (Hesych. ἀγάζειν βαρέως φέρειν, *E. M.* ἀγάζειν ἀγανακτεῖ καὶ βαρέως φέρεi). The verb—cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 1061 (where the meaning is not too clear, but cannot be 'exalt overmuch', as given by Liddell and Scott) and Bekk. *Anecd.* 336, 6 ἀγάζεις: ἀντὶ τοῦ θρασύνειν: Σοφοκλῆς—is certainly in keeping with the diction of the play. So, at 835 f.: οὐ ταῦτ' ἔδρασας: οὐδέν' ἂν δεξαίμεθα | οὐθ' οἱ θανόντες οὐθ' ἂν οἱ τετρωμένοι | ἄλλον κτέ., I find δεξαίμεθα so unnatural that I am tempted by the Wardour Street διζοίμεθα\*.

<sup>2</sup> The reading is there doubtful but the doubts hardly affect the point at issue. My own version would be something like: μάτηρ δ' ὥσπερ πτανοῖς κλαγγὰν | ὀρνισιν, ὅπως ἐξάρξω γὰρ | μολπᾶν οὐ τὰν αὐτὰν (ἄχ' ἂν) | οἷαν ποτὲ δὴ | σκίπτειν Πριάμῳ διεριδομένῳ | ποδὸς ἀρχεχόρου πλαγαῖς Φρυγίους | εὐκόμπος ἐξήρχον θεοῦς.—ὥσπερ V: ὥσπερ τις P || μολπᾶν\*: μολπᾶν || (ἄχ' ἂν)\* || διεριδομένῳ Herwerden: διεριδομένα || Φρυγίους Wilamowitz: Φρυγίαις.

it. F  
exper

'Tha  
to la  
to an  
δρώσ  
με ψέ  
P  
there  
seem  
more  
exper  
Phoe

To al  
at th  
the u  
Hel. 8  
some

And  
seems  
manu  
οἰκτρο  
scholi  
φέρει  
Dobro  
ἀλλ' ὅ  
So

Still,  
Iocas  
ἐπίοχ  
Hr. μ  
ἡγοῦ  
ἡμῶν

it. But why not accept the word and equip it with a meaning and a mission at the expense of a dot?

Οδ. πῶς; οὐ γὰρ οἶδα δεσπότης κεκτημένος.

Εκ. ὁμοια\*· κισσὸς δρυὸς ὅπως τῆσδ' ἐξομαι.

'That is all one', says Hecuba, answering the hint that she was hardly in a position to lay down the law with phrases like πολλή γ' ἀνάγκη: 'I will cling to the girl as ivy to an oak.' For the idiom in tragedy, see *Syrhl.* 1068 f. *Ιφ.* ἀλλ' οὐδέ τοί σοι πείσομαι δρώσῃ τάδε. | *Ευ.* ὁμοιον· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κίχης μ' ἐλὼν χερὶ, *Aesch. Ag.* 1403 σὺ δ' αἰνεῖν εἴτε με ψέγειν θέλεις | ὁμοιον, *ib.* 1239 καὶ τῶνδ' ὁμοιον εἴ τι μὴ πείθω. τί γάρ; | τὸ μέλλον ἤξει.

Punctuation is hardly a major difficulty of the reader of Euripides, but here and there he stumbles on a passage where the presence or absence of a comma or a colon seems either to enfeeble the sense or to make emendation, if it should be required, more difficult than necessary. I give, with a little comment, a few cases from my own experience.

*Phoen.* 1067 ff.

ὦή, τίς ἐν πύλαισι δωμάτων κυρεῖ;

ἀνοίγεται, ἐκπορεύεται Ἰοκάστην δόμων.

ὦή μάλ' αὖθις· διὰ μακροῦ μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως

ἔξελθ', ἄκουσον, Οἰδίπου κλεινὴ δάμαρ.

To all this, of course, there is no particular objection; but the technique of knocking at the door was understood long before Macbeth or De Quincey, and, if one considers the use so often made of the tense moment when the sockets creak (e.g. at *Ion* 514-16, *Hel.* 858-60, *Ar. Ran.* 604, *Men. Sam.* 324, and in many other places), there is, I think, some temptation to try:

ὦή, τίς ἐν πύλαισι δωμάτων κυρεῖ;

ἀνοίγεται, ἐκπορεύεται Ἰοκάστην δόμων.

A pause.

ὦή μάλ' αὖθις.

Another pause—then *strepit ianua*.

διὰ μακροῦ μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως!—\*

ἔξελθ', ἄκουσον, Οἰδίπου κλεινὴ δάμαρ.

And the temptation is scarcely lessened by the fact that not one copyist in twenty seems to have understood the elliptical ἀλλ' ὅμως. At *Or.* 1022 ff., for example, the manuscripts now present: οὐ σὶγ' ἀφείσα τοὺς γυναικείους γόους | στέρξεις τὰ κραθέντ' ; οἰκτρά μὲν τάδ' ἀλλ' ὅμως | φέρειν σ' ἀνάγκη τὰς παρεστώσας τύχας, yet on 1023 the scholiast remarks: λείπει τὸ δεῖ φέρειν. τινὲς δὲ γράφουσιν οἰκτρά μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως φέρε. At *Bacch.* 1027, the line ὥς σε στενάζω, δούλος ὦν μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως was, before Dobree, followed by *Med.* 54 χρηστοῖσι δούλοις συμφορὰ τὰ δεσποτῶν, and even at *I. A.* 904 ἀλλ' ὅμως had to await the day of Hermann before receiving its *τελεία*.

So, later, at 1277 ff., there is no great harm in the vulgate:

*Αν.* δράσω δὲ δὴ τί; *Ιο.* συγγόνων λύσεις ἔριν.

*Αν.* τί δρώσα, μήτηρ; *Ιο.* προσπίτνουσ' ἐμοῦ μέτα.

*Αν.* ἡγοῦ σὺ πρὸς μεταίχμι· οὐ μελλήτεον.

*Ιο.* ἔπειγ' ἔπειγε, θύγατερ· ὥς ἦν μὲν φθάσω

παῖδας πρὸ λόγχης, οὐμὸς ἐν φάει βίος κτέ.

Still, I fancy, the trimeter ascribed to Antigone would be better in the mouth of Iocaste, who addresses it to the messenger: see *Andr.* 550 f. (*log. Peleus*) Μενέλα', ἐπίσχε· μὴ τάχυν' ἄνευ δίκης. | ἡγοῦ σὺ (to his attendant) θάσσον κτέ., *Alc.* 544 *Ηρ.* μέθεσ με, καὶ σοι μυρίαν ἔξω χάριν. | *Αδ.* οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλου σ' ἀνδρὸς ἐστὶαν μολεῖν. | ἡγοῦ σὺ τῷδε, δωμάτων ἑξωπίους | ξενῶνας οἷζας κτέ., and, above (953), τὰ μὲν παρ' ἡμῶν πάντ' ἔχεις· ἡγοῦ, τέκνον, κτέ.

This simplest of stage-effects may also have been lost at *El.* 567:

Πρ. βλέψον νυν ἐς τόνδ', ὦ τέκνον, τὸν φίλτατον.

Ηλ. πάλαι δέδορκα, μὴ σύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῆς.

The child's reply grates on the ear, and is probably at once an impertinence and a solecism, for δέδορκα is no synonym of σκοπῶ: with Victorius' δέδοικα, it is an impertinence only. But make her return a plain yet civil answer to her father's henchman, give μὴ σύ γε its proper meaning, and φρονῆς its proper spelling, and the result is:

Ηλ. πάλαι δέδορκα.—μὴ σύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖς.\*

She says, if one may descend to the vernacular, which has its merits as a medium of translation: 'I have been looking at him for long enough.' Then, as the old man makes a motion to lead her to her brother, she ejaculates, like a well brought up young woman: 'Don't! Have you gone out of your senses?' The byplay is clearly reproduced at *Ion* 520, where Xuthus tries to kiss his son's hand, and the son protests: εὖ φρονεῖς μὲν; ἢ σ' ἔμυγε θεοῦ τις, ὦ ξένη, βλάβη;—How often the elliptical μὴ σύ γε may occur in Euripides, I cannot say, but *Hec.* 408, *Phoen.* 532, *Ion* 439, 1335, are adequate instances, if any are needed.<sup>1</sup>

H.F. 1198 ff.

Θη. τί γὰρ πέπλοισιν ἄθλιον κρύπτει κἀρα;

Αμ. αἰδόμενος τὸ σὸν ὄμμα

καὶ φιλίαν ὁμόφυλον

αἰμά τε παιδοφόνον.

Θη. ἀλλ' εἰς συναλγοῦντ' ἦλθον· ἐκκάλυπτε νιν.

In 1202, the most popular prescription is, or used to be, Wakefield's: ἀλλ' ὡς συναλγῶν γ' ἦλθον, ἐκκάλυπτε νιν. The line and the technique are both mediocre, and Dr. Murray adopts from Seidler: ἀλλ' εἰ[σ] συναλγῶν γ' ἦλθον, ἐκκάλυπτε νιν—which is no worse in other respects and accounts perfectly for εἰς, and consequently for συναλγοῦντ'. In my youth, I duplicated unconsciously the letters of the emendation, but I punctuated then as I should punctuate now:

Θη. ἀλλ' εἰ συναλγῶν γ' ἦλθον;\* ἐκκάλυπτε νιν.

'But if I share his pain—what then?—Uncover him!'<sup>2</sup> That the verse gains is clear,

<sup>1</sup> Since no spectator at the première of the *Iphigenia in Tauris* had with him an annotated edition of the play, one wonders how many understood the lines (636 ff.): ἀλλ' εἰμι δέλτον τ' ἐκ θεῆς ἀνακτόρων | οἶσω· τὸ μέντοι δυσμενὲς μὴ μὲν λάβης. | φυλάσσειτ' αὐτούς, πρόσπολοι, δεσμῶν ἄτερ. I make no claim beyond comprehensibility for the following:

τὸ μέντοι δυσμενὲς μὴ μοῦ γκαλῆς,\*  
(*ad servos conversa*)

φυλάσσειτ' αὐτούς, πρόσπολοι, δεσμῶν ἄτερ.  
That Kirchhoff, without changing the punctuation, should have conjectured μὴ μοι γκαλῆς ('debebat γκαλεῖ', remarks Wecklein) is impossible to explain and not easy to believe. But, in any case, if there is anything in the proposal, the progress of error (μοῦ γκαλῆς = μου βάλῆς = μου λάβῆς) implies the crasis as a starting-point. —A probably hopeless passage of the *Helen* (447 f.) goes:

Με. ἀγγεῖλον εἶσω δεσπότηται τοῖσι σοῖς . . .

Γρ. πικρῶς ἂν οἶμαι γ' ἀγγελεῖν τοὺς σοὺς λόγους.

It once occurred to me that the old woman's line might be a faulty correction of:

πικροὺς ἄρ' (Hirschig+Hermann) οἶμαι τοὺς λόγους σοὺς ἀγγελεῖν (= σοῦσαγγελεῖν)\*.

So, at *Cycl.* 288, Radermacher restored πρὸς ἄντρα σοῦσαφίγμένους, and at 252 Dr. Murray's πρὸς ἄντρα σοῦσαφίγοντο ξένοι may be the best cure for πρὸς ἄντρα τὰ σ' ἀφίγοντο ξένοι. At *El.* 413 κέλευε δ' αὐτὸν τόνδ' εἰς δόμους ἀφίγμενον | ἐλθεῖν, it seems to me that a plausible alternative to his τῶνδ' ἐμοῦσαφίγμένων would be the simple τῶνδ' ὁμοῦ σαφίγμένων.\*

<sup>2</sup> Amphitryon obeys, and the passage proceeds (1203 ff.):

ὦ τέκνον,

πάρεις ἀπ' ὁμμάτων

πέπλον, ἀπόδике, ῥέθος ἀελίῳ δεῖξον.

βάρος ἀντίπαλον δακρύοις συναμιλλᾷται.

ἰκετεύομεν ἀμφὶ σὺν

γενεῖδα καὶ γόνυ καὶ χεῖρα προσπίντων

πολιῶν τε δάκρυον ἐκβαλῶν.

Here βάρος . . . συναμιλλᾷται (an unknown com-

and, as the ellipse is human, it is Greek: compare, for instance, *Andr.* 845 ἀλλ' εἰ σ' ἀφείην μὴ φρονούσαν, ὡς θάνοις; *I.T.* 750 εἰ δ' ἐκλιπὼν τὸν ὄρκον ἀδικοῖς ἐμέ; *Phoen.* 1684 ἀλλ' εἰ γαμοίμην, σὺ δὲ μόνος φεύγεις, πάτερ; *Ar. Av.* 371 εἰ δὲ τὴν φύσιν μὲν ἐχθροὶ τὸν δὲ νοῦν εἰσιν φίλοι; *Ran.* 1415 εἴαν δὲ κρίνω; *Plat. Rep.* 440 D (where there seems no reason whatever for Ast's ἀλλ' ἦ, which has become the vulgate) ἀλλ' εἰ πρὸς τοῦτω καὶ τόδε ἐνθυμεῖ; *Longin. ars rhet.* p. 207, 7 ff. Spengel-Hammer εἰ δὲ καὶ πέτρα ἐπιτύχοιεν . . . ; εἰ δὲ χαλεπήναιε . . . ;—and so often. With Synesius, in fact, the idiom has become almost a mannerism.

*Or.* 1170 ff.

ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρως

ψυχὴν ἀφήσω, Μενέλεων δὲ τείσομαι.  
ἐνὸς γὰρ εἰ λαβοίμεθ', εὐτυχοῖμεν ἄν,  
εἴ ποθεν ἄελπτος παραπέσοι σωτηρία  
κτανούσι, μὴ θανούσιν· εὐχομαι τάδε.

There is a gaucherie about the last three lines, which tempted Bruhn to delete ἐνὸς . . . εὐτυχοῖμεν ἄν and replace the verse by <φεῦ>, and the proposal is recorded—one fears, with approval—by both Wecklein and Murray. That εἴ ποθεν . . . is not a conditional clause but a prayer, and that the prayer needs an introductory φεῦ (as, for instance, at *Hipp.* 1416, *I.A.* 666, *supra* 1052) is very probably true. On the other hand, the extirpation of ἐνὸς . . . εὐτυχοῖμεν ἄν strikes me as a species of crime—almost comparable to that worst of crimes, Valckenaer's *μιαρὰν* at *Hipp.* 1441 *μακρὰν δὲ λείπεις ῥαδίως ὀμιλίαν*. For, even from the humble standpoint of the grammarian, nothing is amiss with:

ἐλευθέρως

ψυχὴν ἀφήσω, Μενέλεων δὲ τείσομαι.  
ἐνὸς γὰρ εἰ λαβοίμεθ', εὐτυχοῖμεν ἄν.  
<φεῦ>  
εἴ ποθεν ἄελπτος παραπέσοι σωτηρία\* κτέ.

And the φεῦ and the prayer were alike engendered by εὐτυχοῖμεν ἄν: but for the fact that in Euripides' brain there lingered the echo of that melancholy verb, defective in the present indicative, neither one nor the other would have seen the light. The process—to my own feeling, at least—is every whit as clear as at *Aesch. Ag.* 971 ff. *ψυχὸς ἐν δόμοις πέλει | ἀνδρὸς τελείου δῶμ' ἐπιστρωφωμένον*.—| *Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ τέλειε τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλειε κτέ.*, or in Rossetti's *Blessed Damsel*, where the first edition gives: 'We two will lie in the shadow of The mystic living tree', and the second: 'We two will lie . . .', followed by that child of chance: 'Alas, we two, we two, thou sayest, Yet one wast thou with me. . .'

A prayer of sorts may also have perished later (1512 f.):

*Or.* ἐνδίκως ἢ Τυνδάρειος ἄρα παῖς διώλετο;  
*Φρ.* ἐνδικώτατ', εἴ γε λαμιοὺς εἶχε τριπτύχους θανεῖν.

pound) is unintelligible, the metre of the next two lines is defective, and ἐκβαλὼν should be ἐκβάλλων. For *δακρύοις συναμιλλᾷται*, Hermann followed by most, gave *δακρύοισιν ἀμιλλᾷται*, 'quod si verum', says Dr. Murray (though he prints *συναμιλλαταί*, which passes my own faculty for belief) 'hiat oratio, supplendaque ex gr. σοῖσι τὰδ' ἀμέτερα'. Schroeder concurs, so far as the lacuna goes, and he fills it by <σοῖς ἀμόν>. Schenkl, on the other hand, wished to place *βάρος* . . . ἀμιλλᾷται after *πολὺν ἐκβάλλων*. It would then be clear that the counterpoise

to the tears of Hercules is the tear of Amphytryon, and no omission need be postulated. Unfortunately, the asyndeton is insufferable, and ἀμιλλῶμαι would seriously affect the credibility of the alteration as a whole. But the difficulty can be evaded without the change of a letter:

δάκρυον ἐκβάλλων

βάρος ἀντίπαλον δακρύοις ἴν' ἀμιλλᾷται.

In what precedes, Wilamowitz' *ἱκετεύομεν ἀμφὶ γενεάδα καὶ | γόνυ καὶ χέρα σὰν προπίπτων πολίων τε κτέ.*, while not certain, is unlikely to be bettered.



Presumably, then, not quite so justly in the actual case, as she had only one. Weil, impatient of this Asiatic evasiveness, conjectured, and seized the opportunity of printing: *ἐνδικος τρίς, εἴ γε λαίμους εἶχε τριπτύχους, θανεῖν*, but omitted the formality of producing an example of the structure *ἐνδικός εἰμι ἀποθανεῖν*. I should postulate the two equations, *εἴ γε = εἶτε*, *εἶτε = εἶθε*, and write, with F. W. Schmidt's alteration of *θανεῖν*:

*ἐνδικώτατ' εἶθε\* λαίμους εἶχε τριπτύχους θενεῖν.*

The interchange of the dentals is found sporadically: e.g. *ἀκροθίνια = ἀκρωτριά* Alciph. iii. 11, 2, *μύθων = μίτων* iv. 19, 9, *ἄμισα and ἄμισα = ἄπισα* ib. 10, *πολυθείας = πολιτείας* Evagr. *hist. eccl.* iii. 41 (p. 142, 3 Bidez-Parmentier), *ποτί = πόθι* Rhess. 252—and so fairly often, though not commonly. It may exist also in the faulty lines (1302 ff.):

Ηλ. φονεύετε καίνετε ὄλλυτε,  
δίπτυχα δίστομα φάσγανα θείνεται  
πέμπεται

ἐκ χερὸς ἰέμενοι  
τὰν λιποπάτορα λιπόγαμον, ᾧ πλείστους  
ἔκανε *Ἑλλάνων* κτέ.

In this, *πέμπεται* stands in the text of MB, accompanied in the former by the note *γρ. θείνεται*, an obviously honest variant: in ALP no trace exists of either word. The passage, which has neither rhyme nor reason nor even a grammatical construction, may not admit of certain emendation, but is easy enough to reduce to order. To ignore the metrical flaws for the moment—since direct objects are usually governed by transitive verbs, it may reasonably be inferred that *τὰν λιποπάτορα* is the object of the decidedly transitive verbs in the first line, and that consequently the words *δίπτυχα . . . ἰέμενοι* form a parenthesis. The question is then, whether, in that parenthesis, *πέμπεται*, or *θείνεται*, or neither, is the authentic tradition; and appearances favour *θείνεται*. The percentage of scribes or correctors, who could be trusted to remember that *ἐκ χερὸς* meant *committinus*, or who drew an uncompromising line of demarcation between *ἰέμενοι* and *ἰέντες*,<sup>1</sup> was probably modest. There were therefore two ways of dealing with a cryptic sentence such as: *δίπτυχα δίστομα φάσγανα θείνεται ἐκ χερὸς ἰέμενοι*. Swords may not be usually missile weapons, but here, as was obvious from *ἐκ χερὸς*, they were. *Θείνεται* was perplexing: if *φάσγανα* was governed by *ἰέμενοι*, it was useless and far better away; if not, it must be altered to something which could mean 'send forth'<sup>2</sup>—it might always be recorded for form's sake with a *γρ.* in the margin. In ALP we have the first solution, in MB the second. Had the corrector realized the sense of *ἐκ χερὸς*, he would have written, much better, *τείνειν*. As to the monstrous collision of vowels in *καίνετε ὄλλυτε* and *τείνειν ἐκ*, no option exists, and the lines must be written (with Hermann's *λιπόγαμόν(θ)*):

Ηλ. φονεύετον· καίνετον, ὄλλυτον,—  
δίπτυχα δίστομα φάσγανα τείνετον

<sup>1</sup> At *Hel.* 1495 ff.: *μολοιτέ ποθ' ἵππιον οἶμα* (changed to *οἶμα*) | *δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι* | *παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι*, there is a marginal note by l: *γρ. ἄρμα*. If it is an emendation of his own, he intended it to be governed by *ἰέμενοι*: if, by some improbable chance, it is more, then it is not 'a bold cognate accusative' (as even an editor like Pearson assumed it to be, comparing, of all things, *ἔστηκε πέτραν*), but a nominative or vocative, according to taste, and means 'a mounted pair'. The nearest approach in

Euripides to this sense is at *Andr.* 276 *ἦλθ' ὁ Μαίας τε καὶ Διὸς τόκος* | *τρίπυλον ἄρμα δαιμόνων* | *ἄγων τὸ καλλιζυγός*. Later the affectation becomes more common: e.g. *Charit.* 478, 19 *Didot ἄρμα βασιλεῖον* (king and queen), *D. Chrys. or.* xxxvi. 41 *ἄρμα Νισαίων ἵππων*, *Himer. or.* xiv. 10 *κύκνοι δὲ ἦσαν τὸ ἄρμα simm.*

<sup>2</sup> So, at *Phoen.* 1578 *φάσγανον εἶσω* | *σαρκὸς ἔβαφεν*, P and the scholia alone preserve *ἔβαφεν*, M has the honest *ἔβαλεν*, ABVL substitute *ἐκαμψεν*.

ἐκ χειρὸς ἰέμενοι—

τὰν λιποπάτορα λιπόγαμόν θ', ἃ πλείστους

ἔκανε 'Ελλάνων κτέ.\*

In that case, the dactyls of the parenthesis are perfect: in the first verse they vanish, but, by a coincidence which would be singular if the change were false, there emerges an unimpeachable dochmius, introduced by an unimpeachable, and legitimate, iambic dipody. I have left *φονεύετον*, as it is harmless and, in the mouth of some actors, might even be effective. That its title to survive is not too strong is shown by the fact that the author of the argument to Isocrates' *Busiris*, after citing from the *Palamedes* *ἐκάνετ', ἐκάνετε κτέ.*, feels it his duty to add: *ὁ ἔστιν ἐφονεύσατε*—for the verb, though rarity itself in Attic prose outside Thucydides, met a felt want later.

El. 601 ff.:

ἔστιν τί μοι κατ' Ἄργος εὐμένες φίλων;

ἢ πάντ' ἀνεσκευάσμεθ', ὥσπερ αἱ τύχαι;

τῷ ξυγγένωμαι; νύχιος ἢ καθ' ἡμέραν;

ποίαν ὁδὸν τραπώμεθ' εἰς ἐχθροὺς ἐμούς;

Of this I can say little. No parallel has been adduced for the phrase *αἱ τύχαι ἡμῶν ἀνεσκευασμένοι εἰσίν*, which is implicit in 602, nor do I understand the tradition—a fact which, it must be owned, is not conclusive against it, as I am equally unable to understand any of the emendations (*ὥσπερ ἀτυχεῖς* Kirchhoff, *ὥσπερ αἰδ' ἐμαί* Rauchenstein, *ὥσπερ ἂν τύχοι* Schenkl, *ὡς πατήρ φθίνει* Herwerden, *ὥστ' ἔτ' εὐτυχεῖν* Holzner, *ὡς στερραὶ τύχαι* Stadtmueller). Not one I should have thought was even presentable; but the last can easily be made so:

ἔστιν τί μοι κατ' Ἄργος εὐμένες φίλων,

ἢ πάντ' ἀνεσκευάσμεθ'; ὦ! στερραὶ τύχαι,\*

τῷ ξυγγένωμαι; κτέ.

For the apostrophe, compare Xenocles *Lycymn.* ap. Ar. *Nub.* 1264 ὦ σκληρὲ δαῖμον, ὦ τύχαι θρασάντυγες, *Rhes.* 980 ὦ παιδοποιοὶ ξυμφοραί, *Hipp.* 818 ὦ τύχα, with the fairly common ὦ δαῖμον (*Hel.* 452, *Andr.* 1036, *Alc.* 384, *Rhes.* 56, *Hipp.* 871); for the adjective, *Andr.* 98 στερόν τε τὸν ἐμόν δαῖμον' ᾧ ξυνεζύγην.

Soph. *O.C.* 1189 ff.:

ἔφυσας αὐτόν· ὥστε μηδὲ δρώντά σε

τὰ τῶν κακίστων δυσσεβέστατ', ὦ πάτερ,

θέμις σέ γ' εἶναι κείνον ἀντιδρᾶν κακῶς.

ἀλλ' αὐτόν· εἰσὶ χάτεροις γοναὶ κακαὶ

καὶ θυμὸς ὀξύς κτέ.

Since something has to be read in 1192, editors in the main fall back on such make-shifts as *ἀλλ' ἔασον* (Lond. 1722) or Wunder's *ἀλλ' ἔα νιν*: and, if the stop after *αὐτόν* is sacrosanct, it seems unlikely that any imperative, wearing a colourable resemblance to the word, will be discovered. Jebb, for instance, could only suggest *αἰδοῦ νιν*, with the plea that 'if *αὐτόν* had supplanted *νιν*, *Αἰδ* might have become *ΑΑΑ*'—in which case, we should undeniably have had *ἀλλ' αὐτόν*. An obelus may be the best solution; and yet, if the colon is ignored, a minute and normal change will produce a line which would have arrested the attention of no man, unless it had been honoured by a place in Bruhn's *Anhang*, s.v. 'Fülle des Ausdrucks':

ἀλλαι γονεῦσι\* χάτεροις γοναὶ κακαὶ

καὶ θυμὸς ὀξύς κτέ.

'To other fathers also are other froward sons and tempers of the shortest' does not,

<sup>1</sup> The interjection might perhaps be restored at *I.A.* 552, where the chorus deprecates too ardent love: *ἀπένεπα νιν ἀμετέρων*, | *Κύπρι καλλίστα, θαλάμων*. The trouble too clearly lay

in enforcing the veto, and the best chance, it would seem, was to say with a hypodistole: *ἀπένεπ', ὦ, νιν ἀμετέρων κτέ*. The conceit need not be paralleled.

it is true, betray that lapidary style, perfected by the assiduous composition of telegrams, which Jebb detected in Nauck; but otherwise, I can see little objection to it: for the turn with *ἕτερος* and *ἄλλος*, compare such passages as Hdt. iii. 100 in *ἐτέρων δὲ ἐστὶ Ἰνδῶν ὁδε ἄλλος τρόπος*.

A number of passages, none of which call for much discussion, may be grouped together:

Hel. 1073 f.

ΕΛ. σὲ χρηὴ βραβεύειν πάντα· πόμπιμοι μόνον  
λαίφει πνοαὶ γένοιντο καὶ νεὺς δρόμος.

Pearson imaginatively renders *νεὺς δρόμος* by 'a hurrying keel'. Prosaic natures, who doubt whether the same pair of words can mean, regularly and often, 'the ship's course', and, irregularly and once, 'a hurrying keel', take refuge in *κοῦριος*, *κάπονος*, καὶ *λεῖος*, *κάπημων*, καὶ *ταχύς*, or καὶ *καλός*. As none of these serviceable adjectives bears a striking resemblance to καὶ *νεὺς*, there seems a place for

πόμπιμοι μόνον  
λαίφει πνοαὶ γένοιντο καὶ ἱλεως\* δρόμος.

For so, and not *χιλεως*, the words would have been written in the archetype of L: see, above, 1024 καὶ *ἰκετεύετε*, El. 987 καὶ *ἡδύ*, I.T. 346 τὸ *δόμοφυλον*, ib. 516 τοῦτ' *ἔρα* (= τοῦτ' *Ορα* = τοῦθ' *ὄρα* Seidler; cf. 294 *ἄC φάσ'* = *ἄ Εφασ(κ)'* = *ἄφασκ'* Badham), Cycl. 2 καὶ ὁ (so 125, 207, I.A. 350 Weckl., etc.), ib. 560 ὦ *οἰνοχόος* (= ὦ *οἰνοχόος*), O.C. 152 *μακαρίων τε θ' ὡς* (= *μακραίων τε θ' ὡς*) (= *μακραίων τε ὡς*), with many similar instances. The corruption *IA* = *N* is, of course, easy enough, though not so regular as *AI* = *N*: an instance which I remember is *νεογΙλόν* for *νεογNόν* at Plut. Is. et Os. 355 B.

Tro. 413 ff.:

ὁ γὰρ μέγιστος τῶν Πανελλήνων ἀναξ,  
'Ατρείως φίλος παῖς, τῆσδ' ἔρωτ' ἐξαίρετον  
μαινάδος ὑπέστη· καὶ πένης μὲν εἰμ' ἐγώ,  
ἀτὰρ λέχος γε τῆσδ' ἂν οὐκ ἐκτησάμην.

Whether he 'acquired' Cassandra or not, would depend on circumstances largely beyond his control, but he had it in his power to show himself wiser than Agamemnon by not asking for her:

ἀτὰρ λέχος γε τῆσδ' ἂν οὐκ ἤτησάμην\*.

The virtual identity of *η* and *κ* is perhaps best shown not by such variants as *πικρόν* for *ποιηρόν* at Bacch. 1048 or *κίονες* for *ἡμόνες* at Tro. 826, but by the difficulty clearly felt in distinguishing the letters when one was superscribed as a correction. So, for example, at Soph. Ai. 715, the manuscripts and Suidas have *ἀναύδητον*, but Hesychius *ἀναύδακτον*, 'h.e. *ἀναύδατον* sscr *η*', says Pearson—and the same process explains both his own excellent *ἀντάρει* for *αὐτάρκει*, at O.C. 1057, and A's *ἱακτορίας* at Trach. 1001 (cf. Archil. fr. 42 Bgk. *εἴκασιν* = *ἴασιν* and Tro. 1232 *ἴασομαι* P, *ἴήσομαι* V).

It once occurred to me that the confusion might lurk in another passage of the Troades:

224 f.

τάν τ' ἀγχιστεύουσιν γῶν  
'Ιονίῳ ναῦται (P: ναῦτα V) πόντῳ κτέ.

Herwerden hazarded *'Ιονίου λαίτματι πόντου*: Murray obelizes, describes the verses as 'nondum expediti', and proposes *'Ιονίῳ νάματι πόντου*—but is there any known case of *νάμα* applied to salt water? Whether it is worth while suggesting *'Ιονίου ν' ἀκτῶ\** πόντου, may be doubted; but I should assume the kindred error (*ν* = *μ*) with more confidence at Soph. Ant. 1329:

ἴτω ἴτω  
φανήτω μόρων ὁ κάλλιστ' ἐμῶν  
ἐμοὶ τερμίαν ἄγων ἀμέραν κτέ.

The refutation of this—though it needs none—is given by Jebb; who, like Pearson after him, reads with Pallis: μόρων ὁ κάλλιστ' ἔχων. The emendation is hardly impressive: of diplomatic probability it has nothing, and κάλλιστ' ἔχων is no more κάλλιστος ὢν than κάλλιστα ἔχω is κάλλιστός εἰμι. I should have thought that καλλι-στεύων\* sprang to the eye—even if the strophic verse had not read: ἀνέπταν φόβω· τί μ' οὐκ ἀνταίαν κτέ.

## NOTE TO SOPH. O.C. 380

There seems to be an undetected case in Ath. 601 E:

ὅλως δὲ τοὺς παιδικοὺς ἔρωτας τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς  
θηλείαις προκρίνουσι πολλοί. παρὰ γὰρ ταῖς  
ἄλλαις ταῖς εὐνομουμέναις πόλεσιν ἐπὶ τῆς  
Ἑλλάδος σπουδασθῆναι τόδε τὸ ἔθος.

The sense they would have desiderated is plain enough, and Kaibel prints, on the conjecture of Wilamowitz: παρὰ γὰρ τὰς ἄλλας ταῖς εὐνομου-  
μέναις κτέ. The sentence, however, and the method of obtaining it are both a trifle awkward, and I should prefer: παρὰ γὰρ ταῖς μάλιστ'\*  
εὐνομουμέναις κτέ. The triangles of ΜΑλιστ'

were mistaken, as often, for those of ΑΛΛαιστ', and the apostrophe, cheek by jowl with the *spiritus lenis* over the ε of εὐνομουμέναις was interpreted by the scribe of the Marcianus as " (= aus). Compare, for instance, Cobet *de art. interpr.* p. 151, where he emends φήμαις οὖν ἐγώ (Aristoph. ap. Erot. *lex Hippocr.* s.v. ἐκλαπή-  
σεται) to φήμ' οὖν ἐγώ. Although, of course, this dative after παρά, common in all such authors, is usually personal, the country at times is named in lieu of the inhabitants (cf. e.g. Polyb. viii. 14, 7 ἔτυχε πρεπούσης τιμῆς καὶ παρὰ τῇ πατρίδι καὶ παρὰ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν).

(To be continued)